

SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1965

(Legislative day of Friday, October 1, 1965)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Herbert H. Richards, D.D., minister, First Methodist Church, Boise, Idaho, offered the following prayer:

O Divine Healer, we begin our Senate's day of decision with a fervent prayer for health, the health of the President of the United States. May vigor and strength return to him soon after today's operation.

We pray also for health of our Nation, her economy, her human relations. May her strength be equal to the task.

Finally, we pray for health among the nations of the world, that our generation will be worthy of peace.

In the name of Him who touched and healed. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 7, 1965, was dispensed with.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the agreement previously entered into, does the time limitation begin at this point?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703 (b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a) (3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the last 13 minutes prior to 1 o'clock today be set aside for the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the majority leader or minority leader yield for 1 or 2 minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Kansas.

KANSAS NEEDS 14(b)

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, during the course of what our distinguished minority leader calls "attenuated discussion," I have noted that during the debate many editorials have been read in to the RECORD concerning the repeal of section 14(b).

The Topeka Daily Capital issue of Thursday, September 30, contained an

excellent editorial on the subject entitled "Kansas Needs 14(b)."

I shall not read the entire editorial, but I shall read one or two extracts from it:

Kansas has a big stake in the battle in Congress by organized labor to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. This is the section of the Federal law which permits individual States to outlaw compulsory unionism within their boundaries.

Kansas voters adopted an amendment to the State constitution in 1958 outlawing the union shop and the closed shop. The amendment won at the polls in November of that year by a plurality of almost 88,000 votes. Although it was an off-presidential year, more than 700,000 votes were cast in the election.

There are remarkable similarities in the situation in Kansas in 1955 when the heated, right-to-work issue was being debated, and that today in Washington.

Another section of the editorial reads:

Kansas businessmen have learned to operate successfully under the right-to-work amendment. There has been no true dilution of the labor union movement in Kansas, nor has it been less effective.

But despite this working arrangement in Kansas and the other 18 right-to-work States, it seems the national leaders of organized labor feel the laws banning compulsory unionism are pesky thorns in their sides.

Falling to stem the tide of public sentiment in State legislatures and State elections, these union leaders have concentrated their efforts nationally through presidential and congressional campaign support.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Topeka (Kans.) Daily Capital, Sept. 30, 1965]

KANSAS NEEDS 14(b)

Kansas has a big stake in the battle in Congress by organized labor to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. This is the section of the Federal law which permits individual States to outlaw compulsory unionism within their boundaries.

Kansas voters adopted an amendment to the State constitution in 1958 outlawing the union shop and the closed shop. The amendment won at the polls in November of that year by a plurality of almost 88,000 votes. Although it was an off-presidential year, more than 700,000 votes were cast in the election.

There are remarkable similarities in the situation in Kansas in 1955 when the heated, right-to-work issue was being debated and that today in Washington.

Fred Hall, then Governor of Kansas, openly opposed enactment of a right-to-work law. He was supported by organized labor but denied at the time he had pledged a veto of any right-to-work bill. Still, when the bill reached his desk from the Kansas House and Senate, Hall vetoed it. There were not enough votes to override Hall.

Two years later, when Gov. George Docking, a Democrat, was Governor of Kansas, the legislature bypassed the chief executive. It placed the right-to-work question on the 1958 general election ballot in the form of a constitutional amendment. The amendment was adopted that year.

In Washington, President Johnson reportedly pledged organized labor an all-out effort to repeal section 14(b) at this session of Congress. He obviously is nudging a reluctant House and Senate in his effort.

Placed alongside some of the lopsided votes other portions of the President's legislative program have received, the House vote to repeal section 14(b) almost appeared to be a defeat. At least it demonstrated built-in resistance to arm twisting on so controversial a measure.

Now that the 14(b) repealer is in the U.S. Senate, the picture has changed considerably. It is not that President Johnson lacks sufficient votes to pass the anti-14(b) bill. He simply lacks the horsepower to bring it to a vote. The Republican and southern Senators, particularly from the 19 right-to-work States that would be most drastically affected, have organized to present an extended debate or discussion of the overall impact and repercussions certain to follow repeal. The administration is unable to invoke cloture.

Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, minority floor leader, is the prime mover in the effort to block repeal of section 14(b) at this session, or in the next. His State has a right-to-work law, and he is committed by common, ordinary, garden variety politics to uphold the position of his State.

Likewise, Senator FRANK CARLSON, Republican, of Kansas, has pledged to join in the extended debate of the 14(b) repeal bill. CARLSON need not tax his memory to recall the spirited battle in his home State over the issue, and the comfortable margin by which the Kansas right-to-work amendment was adopted by the voters in a statewide election. It can only be supposed that his continual contacts with the folks at home have convinced him sentiment in the Sunflower State has not changed materially.

Kansas businessmen have learned to operate successfully under the right-to-work amendment. There has been no true dilution of the labor union movement in Kansas, nor has it been less effective.

But despite this working arrangement in Kansas and the other 18 right-to-work States, it seems the national leaders of organized labor feel the laws banning compulsory unionism are pesky thorns in their sides.

Falling to stem the tide of public sentiment in State legislatures and State elections, these union leaders have concentrated their efforts nationally through presidential and congressional campaign support.

Even recognizing the financial support and bloc-voting unions can and do deliver in congressional and presidential campaigns, the union demand that the President and Congress smack the voters and the legislators of 19 States in the face seems too great a price to pay for political aid.

Floyd E. Black, executive secretary of the Kansas Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO, estimated repeal of the 14(b) section would result in an estimated 25,000 new union members in the State. He did not explain whether they would join through compulsion, or because labor unions would, somehow, become more attractive to them.

Black has decried the support pledged by the State's five Representatives and two Senators to retain section 14(b). Still, it would seem no other course is open to the elected representatives of Kansas citizens in view of their demonstrated desires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bass in the chair). Who yields time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN].

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I want to emphasize that all of us who are determined to fully inform the American people about the wisdom of retaining section 14(b) are not motivated by any narrow regional concern.

In their attempt to have this bill rammed through the Congress, some union propagandists would have the public believe that only those 19 States with

voluntary unionism laws would be affected in any way.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

On the contrary, many of our colleagues from States other than the 19 feel just as strongly as I do that 14(b) must remain in the law of the land.

Ours is a conviction based on principle which knows no lines of geography or politics, because the principle involved here is above either State or party loyalty.

Our mission can be stated in very simple language, Mr. President. It is nothing less than the defense of individual freedom for American workingmen and women in all 50 States of the Union.

If this section of the law is repealed, Americans everywhere—regardless of where they live and work—will lose another significant portion of control over their own destinies.

Their right to determine in the first instance the scope and direction of legislation relating to unionism in their own States would be sharply curtailed—if not eliminated entirely.

No longer would they be able to govern their own affairs in this vital area of human activity through their own representatives at the State level. All the initiative and the power would be removed from them and transferred to the Federal Government.

As a practical matter, it would mean that the people of any State which does not now have a voluntary unionism law would be precluded from even considering such a law in the future—or any other labor legislation, for that matter.

Regardless of changing conditions and public sentiment at some future time in any of those 31 States, their citizens could not take any initiative whatsoever at the State level to express their will.

Thus it is very clear that all Americans everywhere have a vital stake in this bill—and not just those of the 19 States whose existing right-to-work laws would be nullified.

There is another reason why repeal would be national rather than sectional in its consequences, Mr. President, and even the proponents of the bill admit it.

They concede that repeal of 14(b) will add greatly to the monopolistic power already enjoyed by many giant industrial unions. Given the reinforcement of a national compulsory unionism law, union officials would then be able to employ dictatorial power and vast resources against employers in any State of the Union—regardless of the merit of their case in any given locality.

This in turn would further unbalance the collective bargaining concept which already places the small independent business enterprise at a distinct disadvantage in dealing with arbitrary demands by powerful unions.

Those who mistakenly view support of 14(b) as being merely a protectionist effort on behalf of 19 States should consider still another consequence of its repeal.

Anything that tends to encourage more responsible conduct on the part of union officials will benefit millions of union members throughout the Nation, and

there can be little doubt that voluntary unionism contributes to responsibility.

The freedom which voters in any State now have to adopt a voluntary unionism law serves as a beneficial restraining influence on the extremist elements among union leadership. It requires them to think more often of their members and concentrate on working to better serve their welfare.

Without the protection afforded by 14(b), some union officials would be given a green light to divert even more attention and money to political and personal causes not even remotely connected with bargaining on wages, hours, and working conditions.

There is yet another reason why the proposed repeal of 14(b) involves the welfare of all American workers and the national interest of the United States.

It has to do with the long-term stability and progress of our national economy upon which we depend for our material well-being.

A national policy of compulsory unionism would take this country another giant step down the road toward a federally controlled economy in which the dominant force would be the power of a few officials of organized labor.

Once powerful Great Britain stands before the world today as a sad example of where that road can take us. In a most able editorial on September 16, the Wall Street Journal called attention to Britain's plight as follows—and I quote:

The growing political power of unions, together with the complaisance of management, has threaded make-work rules and practices throughout Britain's industry. Featherbedding, which is hardly unknown in the United States, saps industry's domestic vitality and lessens its ability to sell goods abroad.

If we continue to follow in this path, it will not be long until we reach the point where we have priced ourselves out of world markets in competition with more aggressive industrial nations, and when this time comes, we shall simply be exporting jobs to these countries—the very jobs which are the livelihood of all American workers, union and nonunion alike.

It is for all of these reasons that the bill to repeal 14(b) is truly a matter of national importance.

It has been said by some proponents that 14(b) is not really that important and that it does not matter much what happens to it, one way or the other.

Fortunately, however, most Americans still believe that individual freedom is important. They still believe that to compel a man to join a union to keep his job is a fundamental violation of his most basic civil right—the right to earn a living for himself and his family without having to pay tribute to anyone.

Shakespeare said it for us long ago in the "Merchant of Venice" when he had one of his characters remark as follows:

You take my house when you do take the prop that doth sustain my house; you take my life when you do take the means whereby I live.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield me time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. How much time does the Senator require?

Mr. JAVITS. Ten minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S MISPLACED PRIORITIES IN LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for a long time I have been on record as favoring repeal of 14(b), but I have also long been on record as feeling strongly that there had to be certain amendments to the Taft-Hartley law which ranked in importance with the repeal of 14(b) and which should become law at one and the same time.

I believe that the Congress, because of the insistence of the administration on repeal of 14(b) without any amendments of any kind or character except the so-called conscience clause—that is, dealing with problems of persons with religious objections to joining unions—has placed itself in an embarrassing position. In my judgment, taking everything together, the administration has not, in this way, served the best interests of labor itself.

While I shall support the various moves which are being made to repeal 14(b)—and right now the Senate is considering a motion to take up, and no amendments are in order—it would be my intention to propose at the minimum the two major amendments which I have filed.

One amendment deals with the use of card checks instead of elections to determine union representation; the other deals with bringing about the enforcement of no-strike, no-lockout clauses.

Nevertheless, I feel it my duty to point out that the present situation is attributable to a hard and fast position on repeal and nothing else which can and should be corrected. The impasse at which we now very well may find ourselves is at least in part the result of the administration's insistence on attaching top priority to a bill which, though it has a fine objective, lacks the balance necessary to attain the needed broad Senate and public support. For it is clear beyond question—as both labor and management would certainly agree—that there is a wide range of defects in our labor laws. Yet we have focused on only one, and we have done so not only to the exclusion of many other needed changes in the Taft-Hartley Act, but in other labor laws as well.

I note with great regret that we are about to end this session of Congress without a minimum wage for migratory laborers, without minimum standards for unemployment compensation, without extended coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act—and perhaps even without repeal of 14(b)—and in that case we will have hazarded all and gained nothing. And this impasse in which we find ourselves certainly cannot be attributed to an unwillingness on the part of Congress to legislate in the public interest, for rarely in our history has a Congress

accomplished so much in so many fields in such a short period of time. But when it comes to labor legislation, we have gone just about nowhere, and the reasons for this sorry state of affairs are all too clear. The administration has chosen as the majority's priority measure a bill to strengthen the bargaining position of those who already have a union to represent them, and relegated to second place all the pending measures which are designed primarily to help those who have no union wage scale, who have no minimum wage, and who have in many cases worked for substandard wages and lived in abject poverty. Yet we are about to condemn these workers to another year of the same because the 14(b) repealer is the priority bill, which has taken precedence over all other labor legislation.

Nor do I think it would have been impossible to repeal 14(b) this year—and to pass other needed labor legislation as well—if the administration had only been willing to accept reasonable amendments to the 14(b) repealer so that it could be taken up as a balanced measure aimed at correcting a fair range of glaring weaknesses in the Taft-Hartley Act.

As it is, however, we clearly have the cart before the horse, and the cart is off balance at that.

I have repeatedly explained my reasons for favoring repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act: 14(b) is inconsistent with our national labor policy and is in unwarranted restriction on the freedom of labor and management to bargain collectively about all matters of importance to them, including the union shop. My State has never had a right-to-work law, and the existence of such laws in other States has had no effect on New York except to drain business away and foster the so-called runaway shop.

Repeal presents no civil liberties question, for representatives of a broad cross-section of established civil liberties organizations testified in hearings before the Subcommittee on Labor in support of the bill. Indeed, while it is often argued that this bill amounts to an invasion of freedom because it allegedly compels membership in a private organization, quite the opposite is true. The bill compels nothing. It permits a company and a union to bargain about the union shop. If they freely choose to agree upon a union shop, then it is the union shop agreement, and not the Taft-Hartley Act, which is controlling. An agreement is signed by an organization duly selected by a majority of the employees and responsible to that majority under the law.

Even under a union shop agreement, compulsory membership is never required in a union: all that is required is the payment of union dues. This unique legal treatment, in the case of a union, arises from the fact that the union is itself required by law to represent, at its own expense, all employees and not just members. The union may be required to hire lawyers and other experts whose fees must be paid. Thus, both the union and the employees may be required to spend money involun-

tarily—the union because under the law it has a kind of public franchise, and the employees because they are the beneficiaries of that franchise and must bear a proportionate cost of it.

It has also been argued that unions are too powerful and that this bill will further distort the balance of power. I find this argument far from convincing, particularly because, even if one were to assume for the sake of argument that union power is excessive in certain instances, no such power has been achieved in right-to-work States. Indeed, it is in the right-to-work States where there is no equality of bargaining power between labor and management, where the cards are often stacked against organized labor, and where substandard wages and working conditions have often been the rule rather than the exception.

But there are pressing instances in which legislation is needed to insure that union responsibility keeps pace with union power. Clearly, we need a thorough revision of the national emergency disputes provisions of Taft-Hartley. Certainly, we need a revision of the election machinery in the act, to insure that union power is exercised only by unions which have true majority support. And we need an amendment to the act to insure that when a labor agreement is finally signed and the parties agree not to strike during the term of the contract but to arbitrate their grievances instead, both sides can be made to live up to the terms of that bargain.

Beyond Taft-Hartley, and of equal importance, are the pending bills to extend coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act to additional workers, to increase the minimum wage, to provide minimum standards for unemployment compensation, and to establish minimum wage and child labor standards for agricultural and migratory labor.

The administration is not unaware of these needs. President Johnson in his labor message to Congress, dealt at length with the Fair Labor Standards Act and unemployment compensation, and then devoted only a few words, at the end of his message, to repeal of 14(b). Secretary Wirtz delivered a truly moving plea to the Senate Migratory Labor Subcommittee to act favorably on the pending migratory labor bills.

Yet I regret I must reach the conclusion that other important labor bills were forced to take a back seat to the 14(b) repealer. I had hoped we could have passed all these measures. As it is, we may well end up with none, though I shall vote with those who favor repeal now. If we do not get a result at this session, then I would certainly hope that next year the administration and the majority will take a more balanced view of the many needed labor measures urgently awaiting congressional action and as part of a balanced labor package we may accomplish a repeal of 14(b), which I have supported in the past and will continue to support in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

JOE TYDINGS, SENATOR FROM MARYLAND

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute. In the Washington World for October 1965, there appears an article about "JOE TYDINGS, Senator From Maryland."

JOE TYDINGS exemplifies the outstanding qualities and abilities of this year's class of Senators. He has performed well in following in the footsteps of his father. He has made many contributions; he has conducted himself with integrity and maturity. He has demonstrated in such a short time that he shall be with us for a very long time.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOE TYDINGS: SENATOR FROM MARYLAND

There have been many father-and-son stories in the almost two centuries of Federal Government in this young Nation, starting with the Adams family, when the United States of America was a stripling nation among nations. Over the years, there have been quite a few seats in the Halls of Congress taken by sons of deceased or retired paternal solons, and several in the White House.

The Nation's Capital, which is often called the belly of Maryland, has had on public view since January a young Maryland Senator, JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, who rode to Capitol Hill with President Lyndon B. Johnson's slaughter of the Republican Party last November, following his father's footsteps.

After almost two decades of Republican representation in the U.S. Senate from a predominantly Democratic State, Maryland's former Republican Senators, John Marshall Butler and J. Glenn Beall, had been ousted by young Kennedy-Johnson Democrats. Two-term in the Senate, Beall reluctantly ran again against an ambitious Tydings who was half his age and had twice his vigor, but perhaps not a smidgin of Senator Beall's long political experience as a solon for Maryland and the United States. TYDINGS, elected in Goldwater holocaust, followed Senator DANIEL BREWSTER into the Senate Chamber as a fellow Democrat, the latter having been elected with President Kennedy in 1960.

Senator TYDINGS, adopted son of the late Senator Millard E. Tydings, Democrat, of Maryland, was a college boy in the University of Maryland when his father was running for reelection to the Senate against Republican Butler. He was defeated; then JOSEPH DAVIS TYDINGS determinedly decided to go into politics. And he has done so with a vim and vigor equal to no other freshman Senator.

Since he is a pure Johnsonian Democrat, it was evident on Capitol Hill in January that the Maryland freshman was the administration's and the party's "fair-haired boy." Few new Congressmen get everything they want during the first weeks of a new Congress. JOE TYDINGS had a burning desire for appointment to three specific committees: The Senate's legislative clearinghouses for the District of Columbia, Judiciary, and Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Maryland's contiguity with the Nation's Capital gives him a vital interest in the affairs of the District, where so many hundreds of thousands of his constituents work and shop; as the former U.S. attorney for Maryland he has tremendous ties with the Federal judiciary, and his youth and vigor are

natural assets for the aerospace group. He landed all three spots, while several of his incoming classmates wound up with unwanted leftovers.

Senator TYDINGS is a firm advocate of District of Columbia home rule, has never opposed a Presidential judiciary appointment, and goes along with all space spending requests from the White House. In the District of Columbia Committee he is particularly inflamed in behalf of birth control in the Nation's Capital, where, he points out, "There are many women, mothers of illegitimate children, on relief, who do not understand conception."

The Maryland junior Senator consistently voted against other Southern Democrats early this summer on attempts to water down the (now passed and signed) Voting Rights Act of 1965. On every rollcall he voted against other southern Democrats Democrats against the Dixiecrat bloc. Similarly, he followed the President's line on all appropriations bills so far this year except for voting against the White House on Senator WAYNE MORSE's, Democrat, of Oregon, cut in foreign aid for fiscal years 1966-67. Senator BREWSTER abstained on that one.

Curiously, the two Maryland solons disagreed on portions of the Federal Cigarette Labeling Act. In parts of Maryland, tobacco is a primary crop. Senator TYDINGS voted against his colleague for a 1-year, rather than 3-year, prohibition against the imposition of any requirement that cigarette advertising contain a health warning. This means he stands for the earliest possible printed warning.

A vigorous, energetic worker, Senator TYDINGS has veritably been nurtured for the political arena by his parents and colleagues.

The Tydings family at Oakington, their ancestral estate, in one of the most beautiful parts of Maryland, includes the Senator's lovely wife, the former Virginia Campbell, and three lively children, Mary, Millard, and Emlen, who like to re-echo Daddy's election night statement: "We're a new spirit in Maryland politics."

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield for one-half minute?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Alaska.

GIVE SARGENT SHRIVER A CHANCE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, criticism is raining down on the Office of Economic Opportunity. It is my view that this major program, carrying out one of the numerous high purposes of the Johnson administration deserves a breathing spell to allow its Administrator an adequate chance to get it started, to enable him to ascertain from experience whether the legislation itself is adequate—a very pertinent question—and to test out the capabilities of his staff. Let the critics remember that few if any Federal undertakings have ever been so successful and so deservedly acclaimed as such as the Peace Corps. Its unquestioned success was due primarily to the leadership and inspiration given it by Sargent Shriver. It may well be, as has been urged on the floor of the Senate, that retaining both these two major responsibilities—that of running the Peace Corps and the antipoverty program—is too much to expect of any one man. But that decision is up to the President. Meanwhile, I believe that a few months

hence some of the current difficulties that the poverty program faces can be diminished and on the way to elimination.

A thoughtful analysis of the poverty program's difficulties appears in the October 9 issue of the New Republic. Written by James Ridgeway, it is entitled "Why the Poverty Program Seems a Muddle."

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY THE POVERTY WAR SEEMS A MUDDLE

Trying to make sense of the antipoverty war is like wrestling in a hammock. The Office of Economic Opportunity, in Washington, seems like a bedlam even though the people in it are all earnestly striving to push the war forward on all fronts. And the reason, one finally realizes, is that the antipoverty program does not really have a strategy for conquering poverty. It has a man, Sargent Shriver, but it does not have a plan. It does not have jobs for large numbers of unemployed people. The new Housing Act will not provide anywhere enough accommodations for the large number of people living in slums. And the program is not equipped to break the hammerlock of de facto segregation in schools and housing in the big northern cities.

At best, the poverty warriors have assembled an array of tools for poking about in the slums. The people there can be provided with lawyers and doctors; little children can go to preschools where they are taught and fed; the neighborhood workers offer a more efficient means for shuttling welfare clients to Government offices where their needs can be ministered to more quickly; the project can provide training to get some people into some jobs. And if the OEO insists, as it has not yet done, on making sure the poor have a major hand in running the programs that affect them, it may provide them with a means for making city hall pay more attention to their needs, and in doing so reinvigorate the institutions of democratic government.

These are not unimpressive aims. But in the end, they will not be sufficient to stand masses of poor people on their feet, able to make a go of it in this society. This is the real difficulty with the antipoverty war. It lies behind the other, pepper-shot criticisms that are raining down on Mr. Shriver from left, right and center. He is in for another round of congressional keelhauling. And lately he has run into heavy going in his own shop.

Half a dozen top aids are leaving. And while it is insisted that their departures were planned long ago, two of them, Richard Boone, a top community action program official, and Jack Conway, deputy director, have left their associates with deep impressions of their frustrations and even bitterness in dealing with Shriver. Boone, apparently because he was increasingly displeased by the lack of real participation by the poor themselves in running local programs, found himself gradually frozen out of the antipoverty war's hierarchy. Conway tried to establish a modicum of administrative order at the headquarters office, only to be confounded by Shriver who refused to loose his own hands from the smallest administrative details and who apparently tolerates the petty slanders that go on among his employees.

Boone left to become executive director of the Citizens Crusade against Poverty, which is headed by Walter Reuther and looks

very much like the beginnings of the labor movement's own war against poverty. While this group's plans still are nebulous, there are suggestions that it may find the resources and the people to begin community action programs run more openly by people living in the impoverished neighborhoods. This can be a difficult job for the Federal Government itself to do, since it may result in putting ghetto neighborhoods in seeming revolt against a mayor who may well be a Democrat. It is conceivable that if the labor unions took an active hand in promoting such neighborhood groups, reluctant city Democrat politicians might be brought to the point of letting the poor run their own poverty programs instead of bossing them around.

Conway, who had come to Shriver from the AFL-CIO, sought to establish a line of administrative order at the OEO. In part that would mean putting an end to embarrassing mistakes. For instance, last winter the Wisconsin State poverty director was given a small grant to lay out programs in the State. But within a couple of months the checks stopped arriving and he was having difficulty paying the staff. When one of Senator GAYLORD NELSON's assistants called the OEO in Washington to find out what had happened, he was told the Wisconsin man was a pain in the neck and that so long as he kept pestering Washington he would not get any more money.

In another instance a VISTA recruiter got together a crew of poor Negroes in San Francisco, and promised to send them to Chicago for training. Some quit their jobs on that promise. But when the field recruiter returned to Washington, he was told the San Francisco Negroes were not needed.

Shriver has taken a personal interest in administration, and while his insistence on knowing all the details of grants before signing them probably is useful in keeping bureaucrats on their toes, these grant-signing occasions apparently from time to time degenerated into mean, backbiting sessions between Conway and William Haddad, the Inspector General. Haddad, who also has resigned, was charged with looking into field operations with an eye to finding out what was going wrong with the programs. But the trouble seems to have been that the Inspector General's people concerned themselves less with substantive difficulties of the programs than with information impugning the personal competence or character of the people working under Conway's direction. At the grant-signing sessions at poverty headquarters, one gathers, accusations flew back and forth, resulting in a good deal of ill feeling on the part of Conway, who stood up for his people. When he announced his departure from OEO, Conway told his staff that he hoped to accomplish more for the poverty program from the outside than by working within.

Reports of the arguments in the higher reaches of the OEO may be exaggerated, but they have had a pervasive and depressing effect in the lower echelons, which utterly detest the work of the Inspector General's Office. It is called "The fink shop"—not so much because of its criticisms of their programs but because of the suspicion that its files consist of personal gossip. The consequence is that far from Shriver having a staff full of new ideas, the people at the poverty program are tending to become cautious and conservative.

All of this puts the Office of Economic Opportunity and its director, Mr. Shriver, in an unenviable spot. It has no real plan for ending poverty. The employees, who always have been a spirited and restless group, now find themselves in the midst of a depressing office squabble. This sort of situation can result in the creation of just another

dead bureaucracy. It might end with the people who came to work in hopes of ending poverty believing that their own livelihoods depend on perpetuating the existence of the poor.

JAMES RIDGEWAY.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

AMENDMENT OF SHIPPING ACT OF 1916 AND THE SHIP MORTGAGE ACT OF 1920

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendment from the House on S. 2118.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2118) to amend sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection O of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920, which was, on page 6, line 22, strike out all after "1920," over through and including line 4 on page 7.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House and request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. DOMINICK conferees on the part of the Senate.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, on my time, not to exceed 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the last 7 minutes on my side be reserved to the minority leader; and 5 minutes for the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The following routine business was transacted by unanimous consent during the consideration of the pending motion to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 77:

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 32. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 106. Joint resolution to allow the showing in the United States of the U.S. Information Agency film "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums";

H.R. 9042. An act to provide for the implementation of the Agreement Concerning Automotive Products Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7059. An act to amend the Act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 724; 20 U.S.C. 79-79e), so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to the Smithsonian Institution for use in carrying out its functions under said act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7484. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the rank of lieutenant general or vice admiral of officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force while serving as Surgeons General;

H.R. 5571. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of incentive pay for submarine duty to personnel qualified in submarines attached to staffs of submarine operational commanders;

H.R. 1805. An act to amend section 5899 of title 10, United States Code, to provide permanent authority under which Naval Reserve officers in the grade of captain shall be eligible for consideration for promotion when their running mates are eligible for consideration for promotion;

H.R. 10238. An act to provide labor standards for certain persons employed by Federal contractors to furnish services to Federal agencies, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9247. An act to provide for participation of the United States in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition to be held at San Antonio, Tex., in 1968, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7169. An act to amend the Securities Act of 1933 with respect to certain registration fees.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on Thursday, October 7, 1965, the Vice President signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 306. An act to amend the Clean Air Act to require standards for controlling the emission of pollutants from certain motor vehicles, to authorize a research and development program with respect to solid-waste disposal, and for other purposes;

S. 322. An act for the relief of Choy-Sim Mah;

S. 611. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Mount Edgecumbe Boarding School, Alaska;

S. 779. An act for the relief of Henryka Lyska;

S. 903. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to painting, illumination, and dismantlement of radio towers;

S. 1012. An act for the relief of Dr. Otto F. Kernberg;

S. 1397. An act for the relief of Vasileos Koutsougeanopoulos;

S. 1576. An act to amend the act of May 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 98), as amended, providing for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo., and for other purposes;

S. 1689. An act to amend paragraph (a) of the act of March 4, 1913, as amended by the act of January 31, 1931 (16 U.S.C. 502);

S. 1775. An act for the relief of Erich Gansmuller;

S. 1856. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell uniform clothing to the Naval Sea Cadet Corps;

S. 1873. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clara W. Dollar;

S. 2232. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for a loan service of captioned films for the deaf," approved September 2, 1958, as amended, in order to further provide for a loan service of educational media for the deaf, and for other purposes;

S. 2273. An act to render immune from seizure under judicial process certain objects of cultural significance imported into the United States for temporary display or exhibition, and for other purposes;

H.R. 724. An act to authorize the transfer of certain Canal Zone prisoners to the custody of the Attorney General;

H.R. 3045. An act to authorize certain members of the Armed Forces to accept and wear decorations of certain foreign nations;

H.R. 5665. An act to authorize disbursing officers of the Armed Forces to advance funds to members of an armed force of a friendly foreign nation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6165. An act to repeal section 165 of the Revised Statutes relating to the appointment of women to clerkships in the executive departments;

H.R. 7329. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of San Diego, Calif.;

H.R. 9336. An act to amend title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 relating to certain claims against the Government of Cuba;

H.R. 9975. An act to authorize the shipment, at Government expense, to, from, and within the United States and between overseas areas of privately owned vehicles of deceased or missing personnel, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10234. An act to amend section 1085 of title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the reimbursement procedure required among the medical facilities of the Armed Forces under the jurisdiction of the military departments;

H.R. 10871. An act making appropriations for Foreign Assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 69. Joint resolution to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to construct the third Library of Congress building in square 732 in the District of Columbia to be named the James Madison Memorial Building and to contain a Madison Memorial Hall, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1966 (S. Doc. No. 62)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, in the amount of \$134,966,000, for various departments and agencies (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the U.S. Coast Guard for "Operating expenses," for the fiscal year 1966, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Post Office Department for "Operations," for the fiscal year 1966, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the U.S. Coast Guard for "Retired pay," for the fiscal year 1966 had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the U.S. Coast Guard for "Reserve training," for the fiscal year 1966, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON AIR FORCE RESERVE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Air Force Reserve construction program (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON BORROWING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on borrowing authority, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CERTIFICATION OF ADEQUATE SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION, LEWIS CREEK UNIT, FRIANT-KERN DIVISION, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Lewis Creek Unit, Friant-Kern Division, Central Valley Project, California (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of Aurora Zvejnieks, of Indianapolis, Ind., favoring action to liberate the Baltic States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Two resolutions adopted by the Arkansas Legislative Council, of Little Rock, Ark., relating to payments in lieu of taxes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Westchester County, N.Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to designate October 12, Columbus Day, as a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Illinois Typographical Conference, Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1781, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of professional strikebreakers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Whitney Gilliland, of Iowa, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board; and Charles A. Webb, of Virginia, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, I also report favorably sundry nominations in the Coast Guard. Since these names have previously appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing them on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

Edward L. Bailey, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Coast Guard.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 2617. A bill for the relief of Dr. Marcel Grdinic; to the Committee on the Judiciary. (See the remarks of Mrs. NEUBERGER when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DODD:

S. 2618. A bill for the relief of Lok Tim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DR. MARCEL GRDINIC

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am introducing a private immigration bill for the relief of Dr. Marcel Grdinic. In this connection I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD recent correspondence on this case from Drs. V. Boekelheide, head, department of chem-

istry, and Arthur S. Flemming, president, University of Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the correspondence will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2617) for the relief of Dr. Marcel Grdinic, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The correspondence presented by Mrs. NEUBERGER is as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,
October 4, 1965.

HON. MAURINE NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Dr. Virgil Boekelheide, who is head of the chemistry department at the University of Oregon, has provided me with a copy of the letter which he has addressed to you relative to Dr. Marcel Grdinic.

Dr. Boekelheide has described the situation which confronts us very clearly and accurately. I would like to support the request that he has made for an extension of Dr. Grdinic's visa.

It is clear to me that a vigorous and conscientious effort was made on part of the department of chemistry to find a replacement for Dr. Grdinic. The resignation of his replacement after May 1 made it virtually impossible for us to obtain someone else. We try to adhere strictly to the policy of not extending invitations to members of other faculties to join our faculty after May 1. We believe this is the only sound and fair policy to follow.

Our staffing plans, including the position occupied by Dr. Grdinic, were based on the assumption that we would have an enrollment of 11,300 this fall. It is now clear that the enrollment will be approximately 12,000. This puts us in an even more difficult position.

I want at the same time to join Dr. Boekelheide in assuring the Department of State that we will not ask for any further extension of Dr. Grdinic's visa beyond the present academic year.

I sincerely hope that it may be possible for the State Department to grant this request.

Very sincerely and cordially yours,
ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
President.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,
September 29, 1965.

HON. MAURINE NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senator, Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: I am writing to you with regard to Dr. Marcel Grdinic who has sought your help in obtaining an extension of his visitor's exchange visa which expired September 14, 1965.

Dr. Grdinic holds an appointment in our chemistry department as a visiting assistant professor. He first came to the University of Oregon as a postdoctoral fellow doing research under a National Institutes of Health grant. With rising enrollments and because of his evident ability and his desire to gain this experience we gave him a temporary post on our teaching staff. He has been very successful in this position. He is a gifted lecturer, he works hard and conscientiously with his students, and in all respects he has discharged his duties faithfully.

Realizing that persons residing in this country on a visitor's exchange visa are expected to have only a limited stay we sought

to replace Dr. Grdinic during the past academic year. In fact, we made an offer to a prospective candidate who first accepted it and then resigned in May for personal reasons. We were thus left with essentially no hope of making another suitable appointment in time for this academic year. I asked Dr. Grdinic whether he would be willing to continue his appointment for another year and he indicated that he would be pleased to do this.

As it turned out, the enrollment at the University of Oregon this fall looks to be very much larger than anyone expected. Although the final figures aren't yet available, it appears that the increase in size is about 16 percent, or double what was anticipated. With this increase we are very hard put to meet our teaching needs with Dr. Grdinic present. If he were to be denied further extension of his visa, we would be in a very difficult situation.

If there is any way in which you can be of help in securing an extension of his visa until the end of this academic year, we would deeply appreciate it.

Last year the Immigration Service granted an extension of Dr. Grdinic's visa without any difficulty. It may be that they are now taking their present position against extension of his visa because they feel that such requests will be continued indefinitely. I would be glad to assure them and I can assure you now that we will not ask for any further extension of Dr. Grdinic's visa beyond the present academic year. We have been continuing our search for personnel and have a commitment from a candidate who would be able to take over Dr. Grdinic's duties in the fall of 1966 but not before.

In summary, the extension of Dr. Grdinic's visa for this academic year, particularly now that classes are already in session, would be a great service to the university and would be very helpful to Dr. Grdinic who is seeking this additional training and experience. It is hard for me to see why the granting of this request would in any way be inimical to the best interests of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

V. BOEKELHEIDE,
Head, Department of Chemistry.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of September 30, 1965, the name of Mr. HARTKE was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 2579) to amend section 5(1) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide benefits for children of deceased railroad employees who are over the age of 18 and below the age of 22 and are attending an educational institution as full-time students, introduced by Mr. JAVITS on September 30, 1965.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 8, 1965, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 306. An act to amend the Clean Air Act to require standards for controlling the emission of pollutants from certain motor vehicles, to authorize a research and development program with respect to solid-waste disposal, and for other purposes;

S. 322. An act for the relief of Choy-Sim Mah;

S. 611. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Mount Edgecumbe Boarding School, Alaska;

S. 779. An act for the relief of Henryka Lyska;

S. 903. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to painting, illumination, and dismantlement of radio towers;

S. 1012. An act for the relief of Dr. Otto F. Kernberg;

S. 1397. An act for the relief of Vasileos Koutsougeanopoulos;

S. 1576. An act to amend the act of May 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 98), as amended, providing for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old Saint Louis, Mo., and for other purposes;

S. 1689. An act to amend paragraph (a) of the act of March 4, 1913, as amended by the act of January 31, 1931 (16 U.S.C. 502);

S. 1775. An act for the relief of Erich Gansmuller;

S. 1856. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell uniform clothing to the Naval Sea Cadet Corps;

S. 1873. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clara W. Dollar;

S. 2232. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for a loan service of captioned films for the deaf", approved September 2, 1958, as amended, in order to further provide for a loan service of educational media for the deaf, and for other purposes;

S. 2273. An act to render immune from seizure under judicial process certain objects of cultural significance imported into the United States for temporary display or exhibition, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 69. Joint resolution to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to construct the third Library of Congress building in square 732 in the District of Columbia to be named the James Madison Memorial Building and to contain a Madison Memorial Hall, and for other purposes.

RESCHEDULING OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF FREDERICK LANDIS, OF INDIANA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE U.S. CUSTOMS COURT

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the public hearing scheduled for Thursday, October 14, 1965, at 10:30 a.m., on the nomination of Frederick Landis, of Indiana, to be a judge of the U.S. customs court, has been rescheduled for Wednesday, October 13, 1965, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Thomas W. Sorrell, of Vermont, to be U.S. marshal, district of Vermont, term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Friday, October 15, 1965, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomi-

nation, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

COLUMBUS DAY, A NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Westchester County on the subject of designating Columbus Day a national legal holiday.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 154, 1965

To the Board of Supervisors of Westchester County, N.Y.:

Your Committee on Legislation has considered Resolution 143-1965, adopted by your board on August 16, 1965, requesting support of bills now pending in Congress which would designate Columbus Day, October 12, as a national legal holiday.

There have been, over the years, many bills presented in both the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives, all in support of designating Columbus Day as a national holiday, and like our other national holidays setting the day aside in recognition of a memorable event or personage. Your committee feels that all Americans should indicate their interest and desire that this day, October 12, be added to those other important commemorative days, and offers the following resolution:

"Whereas the State of New York, and the majority of other States recognize October 12, known as Columbus Day, as a legal holiday; and

"Whereas many businesses and industries also recognize and observe Columbus Day as a holiday; and

"Whereas it is fitting that honor and tribute should be paid to the great explorer, Christopher Columbus, who is renowned as the discoverer of America: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is respectfully memorialized to enact legislation, as set forth in S. 461 (DODD) and H.R. 7804 (OTTINGER), and/or any other bills previously considered and any amendments thereto whose main purpose and objective is to designate the 12th day of October in each year as a legal public holiday; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Members of the Senate from the State of New York, and to the Members of the House of Representatives from the 25th and 26th Congressional Districts of the State of New York."

Dated, October 4, 1965.

GEORGE D. BEVERLY,
ROBERT J. STONE,
ROBERT J. MCCARTHY,
EARL L. VAIL,
JOHN J. REED,
CHARLES J. COOT,
EDWARD _____

Committee on Legislation,
Board of Supervisors.
WESTCHESTER COUNTY, N.Y.

DO PEOPLE PREFER WELFARE?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, much has been said over the past few months concerning the refusal of unemployed Americans to do farm labor. In view of these charges, the

September 24 editorial in the Catholic Star-Herald, Camden, N.J., should be of great interest to this body.

This editorial clearly substantiates the fact that where foreign workers no longer deprive Americans of agricultural employment, Americans are willing and able to perform farm labor. The editorial illustrates that where farmwork is made available to American workers the "breadlines have dwindled to new lows" as for example in Portland, Oreg.

I now ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DO PEOPLE PREFER WELFARE?

There is a common impression among the well-to-do as well as among those who have never endured real poverty that the poor are slackers and chiselers, with rare exceptions. Such persons look on poverty as the outcome of laziness, shiftlessness, and an irresistible desire to sponge on society. Every so often they raise a cry about welfare agencies coddling such misfits and about the need for smaller doles and tougher laws that tell the poor, "work or starve."

Admittedly there are cheats, and slackers and shiftless elements among the poor—probably in equal proportion to similar characters among the rich. In our opinion there are more millionaires who have sponged on our society than can be found among the ranks of the poor. Just think of the money the Government has lost from loopholes in income tax alone. And there are other vicious practices that have enabled men to grow rich at the expense of the community.

Our concern, however, is to debunk the calumny that the poor are social leeches. In support of our thesis we offer this interesting item. A man named Al Riley directs a House of Hospitality in Portland, Oreg. For years, while the infamous bracero program was in effect (the braceros were imported farmhands from Mexico who worked for substandard wages and created unemployment for American farmers) the food handout recipients in his House of Hospitality reached 200 to 500 during the summer season. Now that the braceros can no longer be imported, unemployed American farmhands willingly seek and obtain work. The result: the breadline dwindled to a new low of 30 to 50 men daily. And who are the ones who still come for help? According to Al Riley, "Those who showed up mostly are old and handicapped men, unable to work."

Remember that when you hear the myth repeated that the poor prefer welfare to work.

THE OVERREGULATED STATE

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, one of the outstanding weekly newspapers is the Littleton, Colo., Independent. It has received several awards, and its publisher, Mr. Bemis, and its editor, Mr. Waring, both friends of mine, have been recognized by their own profession as being outstanding newspapermen.

In the September 24 edition of the Littleton Independent there appears an outstanding editorial entitled "The Overregulated State." This editorial puts into concrete facts the problems which continuing Federal governmental encroachment into local affairs will inevitably create.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks for the benefit of all my colleagues in the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Littleton (Colo.) Independent, Sept. 24, 1965]

THE OVERREGULATED STATE

This shot is fired in anger.

Congress, eager to please a dozen big union leaders since 1939, has made it almost impossible for little businessmen to obey the law.

There are 4 million entrepreneurs in America, and 3,900,000 of these employ only from 1 to 80 persons.

These small businessmen are the backbone of their communities. They are the stable element in a mobile society, and they are proud to provide jobs for families in their neighborhoods.

They collect taxes for the Federal Government, for the State government, and for the city government. They sit up nights preparing figures for government forms. Many can't get this done at nights, and they come back to the office on Saturdays and Sundays.

They pay out money for an accountant to calculate some of the monthly reports, but they are unable to pay a labor lawyer \$20 an hour to be at their elbows day after day.

Every now and then one of them comes to this newspaper. "I am closing up my business and taking a civil service job or one with a big corporation," they are saying in substance. "I just can't keep up with all the laws."

One Main Street businessman had to surrender his records. The Government agent kept them for 6 months. The merchant worried. He thought about Disraeli who said, "A man can stand only so much uncertainty."

After his term in purgatory was up, the agent returned the records. He gave the merchant a clean bill of health.

Another businessman not far from Main Street also had a visitor. The agent asked for a desk and stayed 13 months. Morale in that office went down. At the end of the period, the agent again gave a good report.

Those two cases involved income taxes and excise collections.

It is harder to comply in other fields, such as public health requirements or on labor clauses. Until a few years ago, Littleton's chief income was derived from small dairies. Then the State government passed laws that drove every one of them out of business. Now we come close to having milk trusts.

This newspaper has had trouble with the Department of Labor for 2 months. When the agent arrived to swoop up our records, we had confidence that we were complying with the minimum wage and overtime laws.

But we didn't know what the bureaucrats in Washington have done.

We were assessed a penalty for our sins. We can pay off this penalty from the profits of 73,000 extra newspaper sales (in a town of 4,900 homes).

What was our mistake?

We made two. The first was in looking upon our staff as members of the family. Some years ago we decided to give about one-third of the monthly profits to the employees. The Department of Labor says you can't use this as an incentive. Washington has its own formula.

For example, Employee A, with 20 years of experience, draws \$110 a week as a supervisor. Employee B, with 2 years of experience, gets \$90. If business thrives and both men work Saturday, Mr. A gets \$110 for the week as usual and B gets \$117.

All of this makes a bigger profit, and when profit-sharing time comes around, it would seem logical to pay Mr. A 110 units of profit to B's 90.

The bureaucrats in Washington won't let you do that. You must pay A 110 units of profit and B (the beginner) must get 117 units.

For violating this regulation from Washington, we were heavily penalized.

Our second violation concerned monthly wage earners.

Reporters must necessarily keep odd hours. We explain the assignments to them when they are employed. The Department of Labor won't stand for this.

It will allow a newspaper to hire a reporter for \$1.25 an hour. If that reporter works 42 hours a week, he is to get \$3.75 for the extra 2 hours—making his pay \$53.75 for the week.

It is illegal to say, "Joe, we want you to go to one meeting a week and work 2 hours at it, above your regular 8-to-5 job. For this you will get \$90 a week."

Joe likes that arrangement, but Washington won't stand for it.

The employer and the employee must both keep time cards. They must become bookkeepers instead of newspapermen. The Department of Labor has given us nine paper-back books filled with regulations. They must be studied.

We have asked the Denver office what some of the regulations mean, and we often get evasive answers. One agent told a supervisor that he can't spend more than 20 percent of his time on the phone or reading proof.

The fact is that the Department of Labor can send 10 men to examine our records and they would come up with 10 different reports and 10 different dollar penalties. It's that complicated.

While we were being examined, two retail stores also came under the gun. The Constitution permits Congress to regulate interstate commerce and at present the Department of Labor is only bothering big and medium-size stores, but the agent told us that the little stores will come under the law soon.

Retailers don't consider themselves in interstate commerce. But they'll learn. Maybe they deal with a wholesaler in Denver who buys brassieres in Cincinnati.

This newspaper is primarily local in news and local in circulation. But if a woman asks us to send a paper containing her daughter's wedding to Boise, that makes us interstate commerce.

Our paper sells for 7 cents. If we have to mail it, the price is 10 cents. For this extra 3 cents we get a piece of wrapping paper and a pot of paste. We write the address down just as the fond mother asked us to do. We go to our rubber stamp collection and find the proper stamp to comply with regulations. And we run over to the post office.

That isn't all. The bureaucrats in Washington require that we make a record of this transaction. We must state how much each sheet of the newspaper weighs, to six decimal points. We must state what percentage of advertising the paper contains and submit a marked copy of each inch of paper to the postoffice. We must look up the mileage (907) between Littleton and Boise so that the Government may be informed of the distance we sent the wedding story.

Washington has decreed that we cannot let our newsboys have their newspaper bags at less than cost. Violation of this section can get a newspaper in bad trouble.

Regulations take the time of America's 8,500 newspaper editors who should be devoting their energies to community projects and national problems. The smaller papers are still beyond the clutches of the Department of Labor, but the Department almost got Congress' permission to grab them last month.

The whole emphasis at the Department of Labor is on "equality instead of excellence." This is the fashion of the times, an idea that may mean the death of America.

Equal opportunity is one thing, but it should not breed laws that curb the superior individual.

Australia is worse off than we are. It tells a newspaperman what training he must have before he sits down to a typewriter, and the Government tells the editor what the man's pay should be (equality rather than excellence). Australia tells the farmer what he must pay the hired man. Our Congress has heard of this regulation, and it plans to bring 1.3 million farmhands under the law.

Many other nations of Western culture have similar redtape regulations, and not a one of them matches our production record or the living standard of the American worker. But just give the Department of Labor a little more leash.

What are the social consequences of the "over-regulated state?"

Such harassment means the slow demise of the small businessman. Most of these entrepreneurs struggle with their own affairs because they enjoy that freedom of decision which is their heritage. They like the challenge of invention and innovating. They must not be beaten into submission. They must be allowed to give jobs to 15 or 20 million Americans, some of them old, sickly, or with IQ's below 90.

Washington and Denver have to do some regulating. Otherwise the American people would be crushed by big business and big labor. But the lawmakers must put restrictions on the zealots in the various bureaus—men who think they alone can create the good society.

Uncle Sam regards anyone with fewer than 500 employees as small business. He should release small business from onerous regulations that tend to discourage solid, enterprising citizens.

If he would but keep his hands off those with 80 or fewer employees, he would give breathing time to 97 percent of the business firms. These firms do less than 20 percent of the Nation's business and would hardly upset any Government standards.

Their continued existence is essential to democratic life in 12,000 American communities.

BIG BROTHER: IRS IN THE SOUTH

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I have an article from the Birmingham News of Sunday September 12, 1965, entitled "Taxpayers Needn't Fear Bugged Line." The article consists mainly of statements attributed to Mr. William J. Bookholt, regional commissioner of IRS, and Mr. Henry C. Stockell, Jr., regional counsel. It is the essence of their statement that average taxpayers have not been wiretapped or bugged in the past and will not be wiretapped or bugged.

The obvious flaw in this assurance is "What is an average taxpayer?" and who decides when a taxpayer is average or nonaverage.

We do know some interesting things about the southeastern region, the headquarters of which is in Atlanta, Ga. A number of conference rooms on IRS premises were permanently bugged. We will never know if they were used on average taxpayers—whatever that phrase means—or not. We do know that they existed in Montgomery, Ala., and Greenville, S.C. In a letter dated September 9, 1965, we found out from IRS that Charlotte, N.C., should be added to this list.

Additionally, we know that this region permanently employs a large number of graduates of the IRS wiretap and bugging school. There is one in Albany,

Ga.; two in Atlanta, Ga.; one in Charlotte, N.C.; one in Columbia, S.C.; one in Greensboro, N.C.; two in Jacksonville, Fla.; three in Miami, Fla.; and so forth.

Although IRS has said that it will not permanently bug its conference rooms in the future, it has not outlawed temporary bugging. Further, the large number of trained electronic experts are still around and active. In my mind, all of this detracts from the assurance given by IRS representatives that the average taxpayer has nothing to worry about.

I, for one, would feel much better if IRS would flatly ban the interception of any telephone communications, flatly ban the placing of any bugs, and destroy the mass of electronic equipment which has been gathered for these purposes.

I am not optimistic that this will be done. However, our hearings concerning IRS operations shall continue and it may be possible to persuade the Congress to do what we cannot persuade the IRS to do.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Birmingham News be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Sept. 12, 1965]

TAXPAYERS NEEDN'T FEAR BUGGED LINE

ATLANTA, September 11.—The "average taxpayer" in the Southeast has the assurance of the Internal Revenue Service that he need not fear that he may be bugged.

Southeastern regional representatives of IRS said today that electronic devices have not been used in the past and will not be used in the future in normal cases.

William J. Bookholt, regional commissioner of the IRS, and Henry C. Stockell, Jr., regional counsel, said in a statement, "wire-tapping, 'bugged' conference rooms and similar activities have not in the past and would not in the future be used in the southeast region to acquire information regarding the possible tax liability of the average taxpayer."

They made the statement to the special liaison tax committee of the southeast region which is meeting in Atlanta today. The committee is composed of three lawyers appointed from each of the various bar associations of Alabama, Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina and Tennessee, to promote a cooperative relationship between the IRS and tax attorneys.

The recently controversial matter of the use of electronic devices was among the matters brought up in the committee meeting.

In addition to their own assurances as a policy in the Southeast, Bookholt and Stockell repeated to the committee the assurances previously given the public by Sheldon Cohen, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, regarding the use of electronic devices.

A THIRD LIBRARY OF CONGRESS BUILDING—THE JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL BUILDING

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, last Tuesday, when the Senate approved the House version of Senate Joint Resolution 69, a measure to authorize the construction of a third Library of Congress Building as a memorial to James Madison, a significant step was made toward fulfilling two pressing requirements. The first need, of course, is that of additional space for the Library of Congress

to meet the growing research and educational requirements of Government officials, scholars, business executives and the general public. The second need—and this is not necessarily in the order of priority—is that of a suitable memorial to our fourth President and chief architect of the Bill of Rights, James Madison.

It was gratifying to me to see this legislation enacted for I have been strongly supporting it for many years. It has been my privilege to be closely associated with the efforts to secure a memorial to James Madison and a third Library of Congress Building—as a past chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, I conducted hearings on this matter.

Mr. President, I believe it is appropriate for me to mention an outstanding member of the James Madison Memorial Commission—my good friend, Mr. Clinton Hester—a private citizen who, through his perseverance and sincere efforts, has made a meaningful contribution toward the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 69. I commend Mr. Hester for his work. It should be noted that for over 2 years Mr. Hester has paid the administrative expenses of the Commission—the initial appropriations having been exhausted. Of course we are delighted that an additional \$10,000 has been authorized for the future expenses of the James Madison Memorial Commission.

The James Madison Memorial Building will indeed provide educational benefits to all our citizens and foster an awareness of the significant contributions of James Madison.

RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES—A TELEVISION SERIES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, yesterday, October 7, 1965, it was my privilege to be a guest of the Taft Broadcasting Co. at a closed circuit preview of their new television program series on the first 10 amendments to the Constitution defining rights and responsibilities of American citizens.

This series, conceived by Robert T. Schlunkert, general manager of the Taft station in Birmingham, WBRC-TV, features a study of the 1st amendment to the Constitution.

As a native of our fine State of Alabama, it is with equal pride and commendation that I point to the forthright courage of WBRC-TV in taking a position of leadership in planning and bringing to fruition such a series as "Rights and Responsibilities."

The programs, which are perhaps best described as a determined effort to relate our responsibilities to our rights, present discussions by such persons as Dr. Billy Graham, recognized throughout the world as a member of the clergy who represents both leadership and a high sense of moral integrity.

There are others in this initial set of programs who share equal position in their own fields of endeavor. Pat Boone, famous on movie screen and television, presents two of these 5-minute color television features.

Others participating in this series are Art Linkletter, nationally known as an entertainer in both radio and television, and Bob Considine, one of our country's leading newspaper reporters and writers.

This series, although produced at some considerable expense by the Taft Broadcasting Co., will be offered at no cost to all commercial and educational television and radio stations in the country.

Dr. Graham addresses himself to "Freedom of Religion," while Mr. Considine reviews "Freedom of the Press," Mr. Linkletter analyzes "Freedom of Speech," and Mr. Boone presents a discussion on "Background to the First Amendment" and "The Rights of Assembly and Petition."

I am told that future programs dealing with the Bill of Rights are in production.

Mr. Schlunkert, in introducing the series, said in part:

The great city of Birmingham has been the focus of national attention in recent years as a result of the dialog on civil rights. We recommended the development of this series because we believed that citizens everywhere would profit by a clear delineation of the responsibilities that accompany the rights reserved to us, employing the broadcast media as the most effective way to reach the most people.

Mr. Lawrence H. Rogers, II, president of the Taft Broadcasting Co., said further:

After studying Mr. Schlunkert's suggestion, and recognizing the critical need of a re-study of the Bill of Rights and the implicit responsibilities required of every citizen, we decided to place our fullest possible resources behind this effort. We have sought and obtained the services of eminent performers and writers whose names are calculated to attract the largest potential audiences.

May I say, Mr. President, to you and to my distinguished colleagues, after seeing this preview presentation of these programs, every thought expressed by both Mr. Rogers and Mr. Schlunkert has reached full realization.

For example, a part of Mr. Linkletter's statement reads:

The architects of our Republic put into our hands the most powerful forces for criticism and reform that have ever been accorded any people in any country. They said if you are silent when you disagree, you become the victim of your own silence. If you fail to use this freedom, you abdicate responsibility.

Or take the words of Dr. Graham, a part of his stirring presentation:

Remember how the amendment begins: "Congress shall make no law . . ."

Those five words express the most daring concept of true freedom that has ever existed—no human law can come between a man and God. But this right to enjoy freedom of religion—like all rights—has a corresponding responsibility. Not only must we give to other faiths the privileges we enjoy, but we must make sure that we ourselves do not misuse or abuse this precious heritage.

This series of programs developed by the Taft Broadcasting Co. deserves high commendation. It should make us all proud to be part of a generation that has produced such leaders in this most advanced form of communication—broadcasting.

REVITALIZATION OF THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, Adm. Wilfred J. McNeil, president of the Grace Line, recently submitted to the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation a statement of position and outline of recommendations for revitalization of the merchant marine.

The proposals of Admiral McNeil contain many positive suggestions which would require legislative action and substantial changes in present administrative policies.

I believe that his statement should be studied by all of us who have an interest in the maintenance of an adequate and healthy U.S. flag merchant marine. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to include the statement in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF POSITION AND OUTLINE OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A REVITALIZATION OF THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

I. STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

There is general agreement that the U.S. Government's policy on the merchant marine is in need of a new look if the U.S. merchant marine is to be revitalized sufficiently to play the substantial role in the carriage of our foreign commerce which the American people expect and our national well-being requires. First, it is essential that it be recognized that the merchant marine involved in foreign trade consists basically of three major and distinct segments: (a) common-carrier liners; (b) industrial carriers of proprietary cargoes; and (c) tramps or for-hire vessels. Each segment requires somewhat different treatment.

The problem is by no means impossible or even overly difficult of solution in comparison with other problems which Government and industry have met and solved in our generation. Able men who will apply common sense and vigor to the task can, with a number of specific steps which we outline below, turn the situation of the U.S. merchant marine into one of which we can all be proud.

II. LINER SEGMENT IS BASICALLY SOUND

The liner segment of the merchant marine is basically sound as a result of successful implementation of the 1936 act as a liner act.

U.S.-flag liners carry almost 40 percent of the revenue tons in the total commercial U.S. liner freight market.

With exception of the United Kingdom, our present cargo liner fleet is larger than that of any other maritime power.

Our cargo liner fleet now includes more than four times as many 20-knot ships as any other fleet in the world; the subsidized lines are currently building 75 percent of the world production of such high-speed liner ships.

When the current vessel replacement program is completed, the United States will have the newest and most modern fleet of cargo liners of any nation, with shipboard automation and cargo handling equipment second to none.

III. OBSTACLES TO GREATER PROGRESS UNDER 1936 ACT

Since the passage of the 1936 act:

Successive administrative decisions within the Maritime Administration have added a large body of regulation and interpretation to the basic language of the 1936 act, most of which tends to dilute and erode the parity concept and purpose as initially laid

down by Congress and which was the basis for many of the liner companies proceeding under the U.S. flag.

MARAD has issued a long list of arbitrary rulings over the years denying parity on a number of operation and construction items. The cumulative effect has become unbearable as a result of proposed and possible major disallowances applicable to (1) manning, (2) wages, and (3) pension and other benefits arrived at through open and honest collective bargaining. (Even though some recent decisions by the Maritime Subsidy Board have been reversed by the Secretary of Commerce, the effect of the Secretary's new procedure is still retroactive since new commitments made in good faith under long term contracts would be subject to disallowance after the fact.)

The Maritime Subsidy Board is attempting without congressional approval or action to change the scope and purpose of the act by issuing a series of new regulations and policy directives which depart from the congressionally mandated parity principle:

"4. The granting of the aid applied for is necessary to place the proposed operations of the vessel or vessels on a parity with those of foreign competitors . . ." (46 U.S.C. 1171.)

Continuing inability of the U.S. liner fleet to guarantee shippers and travelers dependable and regular service because of strikes and work stoppages. (A large part of the labor problem is brought on because of a lack of adequate machinery to settle manning and work disputes of an interunion nature that are now aggravated by the trend toward shipboard automation.)

IV. OUTLINE PLAN FOR REVITALIZATION OF THE MERCHANT MARINE

A. Reaffirm the parity principle of the 1936 act and simplify administration

1. Through congressional review and executive action, rescind the large body of restrictive administrative rules and regulations that have diluted the parity principle since passage of the act. (Parity does not guarantee profits; it is intended only to put the U.S.-flag operator on an equal footing with his foreign competitor by offsetting the extra costs of having to maintain high American standards in conducting business in the United States, particularly in wages paid to seamen.)

2. Administrative requirements and accounting procedures connected with subsidy payments are unduly complicated and expensive for the U.S. Government and the operator. These can and should be simplified.

3. Create an atmosphere which will encourage private capital to invest in the shipping business under the U.S. flag.

B. Continue the trade-route concept in the liner trades

Strengthen the trade-route concept further by substituting minimum/maximum ships or ship-days per year for present system of minimum/maximum voyages in each trade route and allow for reasonable profit-making opportunities through greater flexibility in ports of call as service demands for various voyages on any given trade route.

C. Separate ship construction and ship operation subsidy support

Establish construction-differential subsidy payments on a basis of direct support to the shipbuilding industry rather than through the ship operator. The present arrangement needlessly involves the ship operator in support of the shipbuilding industry which has no direct relationship to efficient ship management or operation. (The ship operator is a buyer and user of a transportation vehicle and the separation between him and the shipbuilder should be as distinct as between Boeing and United Airlines, Mohawk Airlines and British Aircraft Corp., or any manufacturer of equipment and user.)

Establish a level of activity necessary to the maintenance of an adequate ship-construction industry. Make subsidy payments to support shipyards up to that level, regardless of the volume of shipbuilding for U.S.-flag carriers. The shipyards, with costs equalized, could then bid for work on an international basis, and be kept sound regardless of level of ship orders from American operators. Conversely, U.S. operators could build their ships abroad and register them under U.S. flag for operation should the subsidy for U.S. shipyards be exhausted or U.S. shipyards were not reasonably competitive even after subsidy. (An example of such a system is the French Government's method of subsidizing shipyards. A construction differential is paid directly to the yards who are then free to bid for foreign as well as French operators' work; in 1963, 35 percent of French yards' work of 440,000 gross tons was for foreign account and in 1964, 18 percent of a total of 538,000 gross tons was for foreign account.)

The present tripartite arrangement involving the ship operator as well as the shipyards and the Government results in:

1. Pressure for uneconomic standardization.

2. The Government exercising prerogatives of management in dictating details of design and construction of vessels because of a false sense of partial ownership of the equipment. The operator, it should be remembered, pays the full world price for his vessel, while the Government is actually helping the U.S. shipbuilder through a construction subsidy. The ship operator is benefited only to the extent that he is able to use tax-deferred reserves for construction of his vessels.

3. An inefficient, uneconomic, and often controversial contracting system between the shipowner, shipbuilder, and the Government.

As an immediate measure, the present tripartite arrangement should be modified to permit a more direct contract relationship between the builder and the operator. Also in the interim, comparisons for subsidy purposes must continue to be based on construction prices in the lowest-priced responsible shipbuilding country.

D. Broaden the national maritime policy

As a condition for a vigorous new Government policy for a larger merchant marine, as outlined below, obtain maritime labor concurrence in cutting costs for all segments of the merchant marine through automation and proper manning scales; and in reducing or eliminating problems resulting from interunion rivalry—perhaps through consolidation of seagoing personnel into two national groups, one for unlicensed and one for licensed personnel, or for some adequate permanent machinery for the settlement of disputes of an interunion nature.

With such assurance, the U.S. Government might then proceed to bring life to other segments of the merchant marine, by giving consideration to the following:

1. Approving a plan for the construction of up to 200 bulk vessels over a 5- to 10-year period, if found commercially feasible, under the terms governing liner ship construction to be conditioned upon agreement by labor to a workable mechanism for the settlement of manning and related work disputes as well as jurisdictional disputes of an interunion nature. Providing operating subsidies for such new and modern bulk carriers in the tramp trades to responsible U.S.-flag operators, including operators presently holding Government liner-operating contracts. Such operators should be required to enter into an operating contract that includes:

- (a) Provisions for compulsory replacement of such vessels through tax-deferred reserves;
- (b) A limitation of operation to shipload or bulk cargoes but without trade-route re-

strictions. Partial cargoes would continue to move in liners on trade routes under conference rules.

As rapidly as the new bulk fleet is available, permit only world rates to be charged (eliminate premium rate payments) for Government-sponsored, shipload cargoes as an offset to the cost of operating subsidies. (As an example of other beneficial effects, such action should also serve to stimulate overseas sales of farm surplus.) The plan outlined above will require additional funds for subsidies to shipyards for ship construction if an additional number of ships are to be built in U.S. yards. The overall Federal budget might well be kept at the same level through reevaluation of national priorities.

2. Making special provisions for industrial ocean carriers of proprietary cargoes to convert to U.S.-flag operation through favorable depreciation schedules, tax deferral on ship replacement reserves, permission to build abroad if necessary, and other similar incentives.

3. Undertaking an aggressive program for the replacement of passenger ships designed to compete on a worldwide basis for the seagoing traveler. (Every significant maritime nation is today embarked on such a program for prestige, defense readiness, benefits to its cargo-carrying trade, and other national interests.)

E. Other steps generally applicable to all segments

1. Establish a Federal ship mortgage corporation and make Federal credit available to all segments of U.S.-flag shipping industry at reasonable rates; permit these and reserve funds to be used for land transportation equipment and facilities where they are an adjunct to ocean transportation, in line with the modern trend toward integrated transportation.

2. Redirect efforts of MARAD to meaningful and commercially applicable research, experimentation, and cooperative assistance to the industry in developing new techniques in shipbuilding, shipping operation, port facilities, cargo handling, integration of different modes of transportation, and passenger-trade facilitation, promotion, and development. The liner fleet operators stand ready to contribute to such a program. Programs such as nuclear propulsion of surface ships, surface-effect ships, and similar long-range research should be left to the Navy to accomplish because of their facilities and the lack of immediate value to commercial operations. These programs would have more immediate promise for military purposes.

3. Take appropriate action to implement and live up to agreements providing equal access to cargoes in foreign trade. Administration of the cargo preference laws must allow for granting necessary waivers to foreign-flag carriers to maintain good faith in the equal access agreements negotiated by U.S.-flag carriers with their foreign competitors under the direction and with the approval of U.S. Government agencies.

4. Continue the present policy of cargo preference, but improve administration through centralized statistical and routing control.

5. Develop and carry out an adequately financed and manned program for promotion of the U.S. merchant marine contemplated by the 1936 act. This activity should consist of an intensive and continuing effort on the part of the U.S. Government utilizing all available information media, direct solicitation and contact, speakers' bureau, and the other standard paraphernalia of product promotion and public relations.

W. J. McNEIL,
President,
Grace Line, Inc.

THE SITUATION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, while there are those who still insist that the administration failed to prove its case in arguing that the Dominican revolt had been taken over by the Communists, the news now coming out of the Dominican Republic should be sufficient to prove to all but the willfully blind that the administration's estimate of the degree of Communist influence and control in the rebel movement was, if anything, an underestimate.

Under the protection of the cease-fire, the Communists emerged openly as the real controllers of the rebel sector.

They openly operated three training centers for propagandists and guerrillas, which are reputed to have graduated more than 5,000 alumni, who have now fanned out throughout the territory of the Republic.

By various devices they smuggled most of their arms out of the zone into the countryside. Some estimates have it that more than 10,000 weapons were moved into the countryside in this manner, while the negotiations between the junta and the rebel forces were going on.

Today in Santo Domingo there is alarming evidence that pro-Communists have been given a number of highly important positions in the provisional government of Garcia Godoy.

There is also the alarming fact that the only two papers published in the entire country are the Communist papers printed in the rebel zone.

The major Dominican papers, which are anti-Communist, remain shut down because of the strike by workers under Communist influence.

There is the further alarming fact that the Communists have apparently been able to take over control of the University of Santo Domingo.

Mr. President, I would strongly urge all of my colleagues and especially those who have had doubts about the degree of Communist influence in the rebel movement, to read the several items which I now ask unanimous consent to insert into the Record.

The first item is an article by Andrew C. McClellan, AFL-CIO inter-American representative, in the Inter-American Labor Bulletin.

The second item is the transcript of a ABC radio program, in which Mr. McClellan was interviewed by Mr. Harry W. Flannery.

The third item is a remarkably detailed article by the veteran U.S. News & World Report correspondent, Mr. Howard Handelmann.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Inter-American Labor Bulletin, September 1965]

COMMUNISTS' CONTROL OF REBELS SEEN AS THREAT TO DOMINICAN STABILITY

(By Andrew C. McClellan)

(NOTE.—The following article is based on a recent visit to the Dominican Republic by the AFL-CIO Inter-American Representative.

It is a sequel to an earlier firsthand report published in the June issue of the *Inter-American Labor Bulletin*.)

Although the OAS Ad Hoc Commission announced that leaders of the two opposing forces in the Dominican Republic on August 11 had reached an agreement of reconciliation and defined terms for the installation of a Provisional Government, it is doubtful that, in present circumstances, the existing political stalemate will be broken for many months to come. Communist influence and dominance over the rebel forces appears to be strong enough to stall any meaningful settlement.

Prior to August 11, in an effort to pressure the leaders of the warring factions to expedite an agreement, wide publicity had been given to three documents drafted in consultation with the two warring factions. The three documents were the Institutional Act, to serve as a temporary political constitution until the election of a constitutional government 9 months from the installation of a Provisional Government; an "Act of Dominican Reconciliation" spelling out the terms of the settlement between the opposing factions; and the declaration to the Dominican people.

PROVIDE GENERAL AMNESTY

The two acts provide for a general amnesty, incorporation of the rebel zone (an estimated 80 blocks in downtown Santo Domingo) into the security zone, abolition of the zone in 30 days, collection of all arms in the hands of civilians, and negotiations between the Provisional regime and the OAS to decide the functions and programing of the withdrawal of the 12,000-man Inter-American Peace Force. Meanwhile, all Dominican officers, noncommissioned officers and enlisted men, would return to their respective bases, holding the ranks and grades held as of April 24, with full guarantees that no reprisals would be taken for their acts during the revolution, except in the cases of "acts of common crime."

While both General Imbert and Colonel Camaano had agreed to the draft documents, Camaano's Communist and extreme leftist advisers informed the OAS Ad Hoc Commission that Camaano lacked the authority to agree to the documents and that such authority rested in the Council members. It is these elements which are now blocking the adoption of the peace formula designed to end the 3-month conflict.

Foreign correspondents and other informed sources are convinced that Colonel Camaano and his collaborators are captive of the Communists and extremists in the rebel camp. The moderate elements are obviously afraid to challenge the extremists who are admittedly a minority faction but heavily armed and united.

Informed sources in Santo Domingo believe that the Communist elements concluded weeks ago that each day which passes without settlement is another day of victory for them. The delay affords them additional time for the guerrilla training and indoctrination programs they initiated weeks ago, and nourishes the seeds of anti-Americanism they have so well planted.

On August 8, the executive committee of the Popular Socialist Party (PSP) met in a "pleno" and publicly announced that it had changed the name of the party to the Dominican Communist Party (PCD) announcing in the rebel newspaper, "Patria," that the new name is "more scientifically exact and eliminates all doubts about the ends we pursue, and presents us before the eyes of the working class and the people as that which we really are—fighters for the cause of communism." The new PCD is the pro-Soviet wing of the Dominican Communist group.

The pro-Peiping group, the Dominican Popular Movement (MPD) now identifies itself publicly as the "partido marxistaleninista" and is attacking the new PCD as being "revisionist." It states that the PCD "remains in its erroneous position" in spite of having changed its name.

The MPD is calling for a "prolonged war against the Yankee invaders," while the PCD has taken a position supporting negotiations with the OAS on the grounds that the rebels are surrounded by a superior Yankee force and should agree to a provisional government rather than attempt a suicidal armed struggle.

The pro-Castro group, the 14th of June Movement (largest of the three groups) is a definite and decisive part of the rebel movement, is consulted on policy decisions, is considered extremely influential among the militia, and is opposing any settlement until the Inter-American Peace Force is removed.

INDOCTRINATED BY REBELS

During a visit to Santiago de los Caballeros, I met some young men who had received Communist indoctrination in the rebel zone. The program had lasted about 2 weeks and consisted of lectures, films, demonstrations, and a little drilling. The youngsters stated that there were large groups from the various provincial areas receiving this type of indoctrination. A second contingent of nine youngsters was to have left Santiago, Tuesday, August 17, for the rebel zone and a 2-week period of training.

Besides the indoctrination program (which, according to reports emanating from the rebel zone, is shooting for a total of 300,000); military and guerrilla training is being openly conducted with an estimated 1,500 militiamen. These are uniformed militia, training with arms.

It is reliably reported that a large contingent of young Haitians is being trained in guerrilla warfare in the rebel zone. Conatral has some 30,000 Haitian cane cutters organized in the Sugar Workers Federation. There is speculation that some of the young Haitians are being trained to infiltrate the democratic labor movement through the sugar workers union in order to capture control of the broad-based, numerically strong National Sugar Workers Federation.

Obviously then, the 14th of June Movement, which is sponsoring these programs, will not permit Camaano to sign any agreement for the establishment of a provisional government until the training objectives have been reached.

Estimates vary as to the number of people in the rebel zone. American Embassy sources estimate a rebel zone total population of 10,000 people. Some correspondents estimate the total to be as high as 15,000. General Palmer, commanding the U.S. forces in Santo Domingo, feels that the 10,000 estimate is more accurate.

The best available sources report that around 25,000 arms are in the hands of civilians. This is the number of arms indiscriminately distributed to the civilians on April 24. The OAS Ad Hoc Commission naively expects that the civilians will surrender these arms as soon as the act of reconciliations is signed and a provisional government is installed. The military and paramilitary training now being conducted in the rebel zone indicates that future guerrilla tactics or campaigns lie ahead and arms will be needed. Most of the arms have already probably been cached along with ammunition and supplies for future prolonged guerrilla warfare in the interior.

THE LABOR SITUATION

Conatral, the democratic labor confederation and the Dominican ORIT affiliate, has remained neutral during the revolution. It refuses to support either General Imbert or

Colonel Camaano. In the early days of the revolution, the Conatral headquarters was assaulted by rebels led by known Communist elements who stole all the office equipment, typewriters, mimeograph machines, tape recorders, and personal effects; destroyed the records and files; and set up a defense command post in the building. Five of the nine jeeps were burned or confiscated. On Saturday, August 14, a rebel defector informed us that some of the office furniture was still in the building.

The executive committee members of Conatral are now operating temporarily from the AIFLD Institute with the ORIT representative. The institute is located in the international security zone. With the four remaining jeeps, the leaders of Conatral have maintained contact with the provincial federations and most of the provincial unions throughout the country.

During my stay in the Dominican Republic, I visited the Cibao area, which is the main agricultural and industrial center of the interior. I was able to ascertain that the democratic labor movement has remained intact since the revolution started. Outside Santo Domingo there is no curfew. Except for the military roadblocks on the main highways, the country appears to be normal. Seasonal unemployment in the sugar industry is normal and the banana workers report that the same situation exists in the banana zone.

All factories are working, retail sales are slightly above those of the same period last year, agricultural produce is easily obtainable and no food shortages are evident in the interior.

The provincial Dominicans appear to be curiously detached from the political chaos in Santo Domingo.

UNEMPLOYMENT IS HIGH

Unemployment has always been a major problem in the Dominican Republic, and all available estimates at this time indicate that the unemployment and underemployment level is approximately 37 percent. In normal times, international charity organizations were feeding 7 percent of the total population. At the beginning of the revolution some 17 percent of the people were being given food. Today, it is estimated that some 12 percent are receiving free food.

Seven of the major banks are in the rebel zone. Many of the labor organizations have accounts in these banks. These accounts are now frozen. At the same time, the flow of credit has been crippled, and businessmen and industrialists operating on limited capital, are finding it difficult to pay salaries and maintain their inventories. Two-thirds of the sugar industry is owned by the Government through the Dominican Sugar Corp. Because of the shortage of currency, sugar workers' wages in the corporation are running behind 6 to 8 weeks.

The OAS, which had been funding the Loyalist government operation, has shut off the funding, with public employees and civil servants unpaid since July.

The Hotel Workers Federation has established a mutual aid fund for an estimated 300 hotel workers whose places of employment are in the rebel zone and closed down. Similar efforts are being made to assist commercial workers and retail clerks who are unemployed for basically the same reason. These two groups appear to be the most affected by the situation in Santo Domingo.

SOME UNIONS BENEFIT

Many trade union groups still find the present situation favorable. Besides those mentioned above, the transport workers and taxi drivers are busier than normal. In fact, it was the increase in vehicular traffic which caused a gasoline shortage.

The revolutionary labor arm of Bosch's PRD, FOUPSA-CESITRADO, and the CLASC affiliate, CASC, are supporting Camacho and the rebels. Because of this, a number of CASC affiliates in the provinces have disaffiliated from the parent organization. Five industrial unions in Santiago alone have disaffiliated from CASC.

Conatral leaders are attempting to fill the trade union vacuum in the provinces and are programming a campesino program in the rural areas. Emilio Antonio Checo, the Dominican leader trained at the AIFLD Institute in Honduras through the joint AIFLD/ORIT/AFL-CIO campesino program, is now setting up a 2-month campesino training program in Vega.

Latest reports from the Dominican Republic indicate that an agreement, acceptable to both factions, has been reached, on the basis of modifications to the Act of Reconciliation. The provisional presidential candidate is Hector Garcia Godoy, who is expected to be sworn in and form a coalition cabinet. The provisional government will reportedly remain in office for 9 months, and prepare for elections to be held at the end of the 9-month's period.

The provisional government will face many problems, which no amount of economic aid can solve. The matter of the arms recovery is regarded as a major problem, as is the political turmoil to which the country will be exposed as the many political parties vie for support during the 9-month caretaker period.

Garcia Godoy, according to his own statements, expects to form a cabinet of "honest, dedicated, capable men * * *". However, under the present political situation such men will be difficult to find, and those who appear to be willing to serve in a caretaker government, are politicians whose only interest will be the furtherance of the aims of the political parties they represent. Under these circumstances, social-economic development is virtually impossible, and political stability a long way off.

[Broadcast of "As We See It," AFL-CIO public service program, American Broadcasting Co., Oct. 3, 1965]

REDS STILL STRONG IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Participant: Andrew C. McLellan, AFL-CIO Inter-American representative.

Moderator: Harry W. Flannery.

Mr. FLANNERY. "As We See It."

Mr. McLellan. Communist influence continues in Santo Domingo today.

Mr. FLANNERY. Andrew C. McLellan, AFL-CIO Inter-American representative, in his latest report on the Dominican Republic, as interviewed for this radio station of the ABC network and the AFL-CIO.

Mr. McLellan, prominent Members of Congress, a number of editors, writers, and professors have made the charge that the Communist threat in the Dominican Republic has been grossly exaggerated, and that the United States did not need to intervene there. What is your reaction, Mr. McLellan?

Mr. McLellan. Well, of course, I completely disagree with those who felt our intervention was hasty and didn't help the situation. I think that Senator Dodd, in his recorded reply to Senator Fulbright's statement, stated the case quite clearly. He pointed out a number of holes in many of the hypotheses of Senator Fulbright's position. I think many people in the Dominican Republic today are happy because the United States intervened when it did and with the force it did.

Mr. FLANNERY. In other words, you are saying that there was Communist influence in the revolution.

Mr. McLellan. Definitely so.

Mr. FLANNERY. What about the democratic labor federation of Santo Domingo? Wasn't it attacked during this revolt period?

Mr. McLellan. On the second day of the revolution, the offices of the National Confederation of Dominican Workers was assaulted, attacked. Equipment was stolen—typewriters, mimeograph machines, tape recorders—most of the written records were destroyed and the building was taken over as a rebel command post.

Mr. FLANNERY. Was the democratic labor confederation able to continue in any way?

Mr. McLellan. Oh, yes. Five of the nine vehicles were either burned or confiscated by the rebels; but with four remaining vehicles, the executive committee of the democratic labor movement, Conatral, have successfully kept the labor movement in the Dominican Republic intact throughout these four very difficult months.

Mr. FLANNERY. Were there some embassies, too, that were not reported in the early stories as having been attacked by the rebels in those early days?

Mr. McLellan. To my knowledge, Mr. Flannery, five embassies were attacked besides the U.S. Embassy. One was badly burned—the Embassy of El Salvador.

Mr. FLANNERY. You had knowledge of this impending event, I believe before it occurred, didn't you, because of our contacts down there?

Mr. McLellan. Yes. We have been watching the situation very carefully since an incident occurred last year; that was the blowing up of an army arsenal at Fort Ozama. The head of the triumvirate, Donald Reid Cabral, invited an OAS investigating team to go down and investigate the situation. While, to my recollection, the report was never made public, they did establish the fact that there were rebellious officers in the army whom they described as the San Cristobal clique which were, in effect, setting the early stages for an insurrectional movement.

Recently, one of the top rebel military leaders defected from the rebel zone and sought asylum in Puerto Rico and on his arrival, he admitted that the insurrectional movement had actually been planned almost a year ago—which would coincide, pretty much, with this blowup of the arsenal. So, it wasn't a spontaneous insurrectional movement. The speed, the efficiency, the professional manner in which the revolution was mounted, indicates that this was planned, and very well planned.

Mr. FLANNERY. What you are saying, Mr. McLellan, is that if the United States had not intervened at the time it did, that we would have had another Communist state in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. McLellan. I would say that there is a strong possibility that we would have had another Cuba on our hands.

Mr. FLANNERY. Is the situation improved today?

Mr. McLellan. I don't know how you would discuss the situation as being improved. We do have peace between the warring factions. There is a provisional government.

Many of the requisites of the so-called act of reconciliation, which were signed by both warring factions, will not be lived up to, in my opinion. One, the demand that all the arms in civilian hands be turned over to the provincial government. I think it's naive to expect this. There are probably over 20,000, or maybe as many as 25,000, arms indiscriminately distributed in the early days of the revolution, in the hands of civilians. While a number of old weapons are being turned in to the arms checkpoints—as stated in the act of reconciliation—many of the new arms have already been hidden in the provinces and, I assume, will be used at some later date when another revolutionary period comes along.

Mr. FLANNERY. What about the Communist parties? I think you said previously

that there are three major Communist parties in Santo Domingo. Are these still continuing and are they growing stronger or weaker?

Mr. McLellan. I think they came out of this much stronger. The recent reports from the Dominican Republic indicate that when these young rebels began returning to their homes in some of the provincial areas, they went back convinced that they had won the revolution. They had intensive guerrilla training behind them—after 4 months in the rebel zone. They are very aggressive, they are returning home like heroes. They have been given intensive training, they know where arms can be located in the various caches and, more important, it was during the 4 months—or rather it was last month—when two of the Communist parties came out and openly declared themselves. The political group known as the Popular Socialist Party held a planning session in August and came out with its name changed to the Dominican Communist Party. This is a party which adheres to the Moscow wing.

The Popular Dominican Movement, or the group known as the MPD, began listing itself as the Marxist-Leninist party—this is the party which follows the Peiping line. And, of course, the larger party—the pro-Castro party, the 14th of June Movement, has never made any bones about its identification.

So, during this period, as I say, in the month of August, the three parties publicly stated what they were and what their role was in this whole revolutionary movement.

Mr. FLANNERY. What is the form of indoctrination and training in these parties?

Mr. McLellan. There were two types of training going on in the zone during this 4-month period. There was indoctrination of youngsters from different parts of the country going on for 2 weeks of, I suppose, pro-Communist indoctrination. Some of the youngsters that I spoke to when I was over there some 3 or 4 weeks ago and who had received this training, said they saw Communist movies, they were lectured to by members of the Communist Party.

The other type of training was strictly paramilitary. Most of the foreign correspondents who visited the zone saw this training being conducted on a day-by-day basis. A group from 50 to 200 or 300 in different parts of the rebel zone were out daily exercising with weapons and drills and obstacle courses. There was additional information indicating that in the evenings they also were exposed to films, movies, and lectures on the manufacture of Molotov cocktails, tactics, sabotage procedures, and so on.

Mr. FLANNERY. Are these three major Communist Parties likely to get together? And, if they did get together at the time of elections, could they win the election, conceivably?

Mr. McLellan. Well, I doubt that they would get together on the election front, although they had no difficulty in coordinating their activities within the rebel zone. We are thinking of a geographical area of probably 6 to 8 to 80 square blocks and they were able to live, work, and operate jointly in that zone.

At the time of the final negotiations for the termination of hostilities, the Peiping lining MPD group took the position that they should fight to the last man. The PSP, which later began the Dominican Communist Party, thought that that position was suicidal, that they didn't have the force or strength to defeat the inter-American peace force. The 14th of June movement would have supported—and stated so—the more militant position—that is to say, they would have gone along with the Peiping lining MPD.

Mr. FLANNERY. Supposing the election does occur and whether or not they do unite, are

the Communists liable to take over, or do the non-Communist parties have enough strength and are they united enough?

Mr. McLELLAN. I doubt that the Communist Party could take over in a free election in the foreseeable future. You must remember, Mr. Flannery, that the Dominican citizens were subjected to almost 32 years of anti-Communist tirades by Dictator Trujillo. I have traveled the length and breadth of the country and spent a considerable amount of time with plantation workers—mostly in the sugar and banana areas—and they have an inherent fear of communism. They don't know what it is, but they know it is bad, and I would imagine it would be very difficult for the Communist Parties to really build up the type of support and following necessary to win free democratic elections.

Mr. FLANNERY. That's the reason for their weapons and for their training.

Mr. McLELLAN. I would think so, yes.

Mr. FLANNERY. They probably don't want a free election then, do they?

Mr. McLELLAN. I doubt it.

Mr. FLANNERY. Meanwhile, is the situation, back in the country, in regard particularly to the production of bananas and sugar cane going on in a fairly normal basis?

Mr. McLELLAN. Yes. When I was there, which was in mid-August, it was difficult to believe, outside of Santo Domingo, that there was, in effect, a civil war underway in the country. The provincial citizens had a very curious detachment to the whole thing. They were going about their business. They were working. Businessmen were complaining about the fact that the line of credits were being weakened or shortened or being shut off because of the fact that seven of the major banks in the country were in the rebel zone. However, I found that commerce was almost normal or probably a little over normal. The sugar workers were working, the industrial workers were working. The only area affected, really, was the area controlled by the rebels—the 80 blocks in downtown Santo Domingo.

Mr. FLANNERY. Thank you, Andrew C. McLellan, AFL-CIO inter-American representative.

Your reporter, Harry W. Flannery, invites you to be with us next week at this same time when "As We See It" again comes as a presentation of the AFL-CIO and ABC public affairs. This program has been brought to you by the ABC network and the affiliated station to which you are listening.

[From the U.S. News & World Report]

DOMINICAN PUZZLE: HAS UNITED STATES TURNED OVER A NATION TO THE REDS—TWO SIDES

(NOTE.—In April, President Johnson rushed Marines to the Dominican Republic to save American lives, prevent Reds from taking over a revolution. Five months later, a temporary Dominican President is in office. The United States has exiled the leader of anti-Communist military forces. The Communists continue to wield considerable power. And American troops are still there to guard an uncertain truce. This question is raised: Who really won in the Dominican Republic—the United States or Communists? Howard Handelman of U.S. News & World Report, who has covered the Dominican crisis from the start, gives the inside story.)

SANTO DOMINGO.—This is the story of the first days under the new Government of the Dominican Republic. That government, headed by Héctor García Godoy, was set up on September 3 under a compromise arranged by the Organization of American States.

During the days that followed, the rebels seemed to be having things all their own way. They retained control of their own zone—downtown Santo Domingo. Government police and troops didn't even try to get

in. They retained control of their arms—thousands of rifles and machineguns that they captured in the first days of the revolution, back in April.

The antirebel station run by the military at the San Isidro air base was ordered off the air. There was no other voice to counter the Communist propaganda of the newspaper "Patria," published in the rebel zone.

Rebel officials got jobs in the Government of García Godoy, including cabinet posts. Rebels made demands on García Godoy—he made no public demands on them.

Brig. Gen. Elías Wessin y Wessin, dedicated anti-Communist, was hustled out of the country in an American Air Force transport plane.

The general was put aboard under the watchful eye of five armed FBI agents and a large detachment from the 82d Airborne Division.

The whole atmosphere was one of rebel, or Communist, victory.

Downtown, in the rebel zone, people sang revolutionary songs. Groups of rebel warriors marched through the streets chanting revolutionary slogans.

In contrast, outside the rebel zone, there were no such celebrations or victory claims.

Instead, there was gloom. Some American businessmen pulled up stakes and left. Others requested transfers, or tried to settle their affairs so they could leave. Dominican anti-Communists, too, were down in the mouth. Some diplomats, from Europe and Latin America, were convinced that all was lost to the Communists.

As an example of the general gloom, an American resident told me: "You are here for a historic event—the first time that the American Army occupied a country in order to turn it over to the Communists."

A DIPLOMAT'S VIEW

One important Ambassador of a non-Latin country said: "Please tell me one single thing that is better for your country now than it was last April, when you sent in the marines. The Communists are stronger now than they ever have been in this country. They have come out in the open, publish their own newspaper, hold conventions, even call themselves Communists, openly."

"All the concessions are being made to the Communists—none to the other side. The rebels signed the compromise agreement to settle the civil war—but now they ask for more concessions before they will live up to their agreements. First it was Wessin y Wessin. Next it will be the other military chiefs. Already, the street mobs are demanding that they go. They are calling your Ambassador, Mr. W. Tapley Bennett, a Nazi—and demanding that he be kicked out."

"Their gall is enormous. In one edition of *Patria*, the Communists bragged in one statement that they were the power in the revolution—and, in another column, attacked Mr. Bennett for saying in April that Communists were threatening to seize control of the revolution."

"In these months of revolution, the Communists have built up their political and military apparatus far beyond anything they ever had here before."

"Also, the rebels now have the mystique—the glamour and prestige that go with standing up to the giants of the hemisphere and the world—the Yankees. They have the heroes and the legends and the slogans and the songs. They think they have won this revolution."

"I am afraid they are right."

This ambassador knows what the Americans are trying to do here—divide the rebels and then conquer them. He just doesn't think it will work. The Americans believe their formula does have a chance to work.

WHAT THE REBELS DIDN'T GET

To American officials, rebel gains at this point seem more apparent than real. The

first job was to clean house on the right. Now the rebel turn is coming.

Rebels have not been granted any one of their fundamental demands.

The American officials say this:

When talks about a compromise settlement opened, the rebels plopped six basic demands on the table. Not a single one was accepted. The demands were:

Withdraw the Inter-American Peace Force immediately.

Fire all Dominican military chiefs of staff.

Name a rebel officer as Dominican Army chief of staff.

Let military men who joined the rebels return to their services with the advanced ranks to which the rebels promoted them.

Restore the 1963 constitution of Juan Bosch.

Reset the Congress elected in the Bosch sweep of 1962.

Acceptance of these demands would have meant a rebel victory. United States is pleased that a compromise was signed—without giving in on any one of these demands.

The Inter-American Peace Force troops stay, indefinitely. The military chiefs of staff stay, at least for now. Wessin was not a chief of staff.

The Juan Bosch constitution is not accepted—and a new one is to be written.

No rebel officer gets high command. Officers who fought for the rebels return to the military—with the ranks they held on April 24, not with the ranks the rebels gave them. A new Congress is to be elected.

Biggest thing working against the Communists, in the U.S. view, is the continued presence of 82d Airborne Division troops. American officials here, privately, express the hope that the troopers will be kept here at least for the 9 months that the provisional government of García Godoy is in power.

A START BY GARCÍA GODOY

American officials are pleased with the start García Godoy has made. He is anti-Communist. He is consolidating his position with the military and explained to officers in advance why he had to get rid of Wessin. He is firming up ties with the influential, "Santiago group" of businessmen. Early in the summer, United States tried to help this group form a provisional government. Now the United States is pleased that the group is helping García Godoy.

Among the things U.S. officials like about García Godoy are:

His firm stand against General Wessin. One U.S. official summed up American objections to Wessin by saying, "He is so rigidly anti-Communist that he creates more Communists than he destroys."

García Godoy's efforts to weaken the rebel side by giving good Government jobs to rebels who show signs of concern about Communist power downtown. These former rebels are watched carefully during their period of "rehabilitation." One already has been kicked out of the job of running the Government radio-TV station.

García Godoy's care to avoid actions so drastic that they carry too much risk of touching off new fighting.

The U.S. objective is to destroy the Communist power—without getting into another shooting war. Idea is to break the rebel hold on the downtown section, and have as many guns collected as possible, before even considering armed action. García Godoy shares these objectives.

The United States is willing to wait a week or two to break the rebel hold on downtown, and collect guns. But it is recognized that, in the end, it may be necessary to send in Dominican troops and search every house for weapons.

Possibility of a pitched battle between Communist and non-Communist forces inside the rebel camp is not ruled out. There

have been gunfights between these forces inside the rebel zone from time to time.

ACE IN THE HOLE?

As a result, there now is a tendency among American officials to look on the rebel "president," Col. Francisco Caamaño Deñó, as an ace in the hole, on our side.

Conviction is that Caamaño doesn't want the Communists to grab power any more than García Godoy does.

Caamaño pledged that he would begin delivering guns soon. He also, according to U.S. officials, has gone back into the army—and accepts García Godoy as his commander in chief.

Others share the growing conviction that Caamaño will turn out to be an important factor against communism.

A Dominican nationalist, prorebel and anti-Yankee, says: "One of the strange things about this situation is that the only man who can save this country from communism, for you Yankees, is Caamaño—and I think he will."

A ROLE FOR THE REVOLUTIONISTS?

The role of Caamaño is just one of the things that make the Dominican problem so complicated. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, member of the OAS ad hoc committee that arranged the compromise settlement, has confided to several people that this has been the most complex problem which he ever has tackled.

The reasons are multiple—and obvious.

Thirty years of Trujillo's dictatorship, to start with, sapped the spirit of the whole people. It was difficult to find anybody who would make a decision or take a stand.

The rebel forces were split into a number of splinter groups—moderates and non-Communist nationalists of various persuasions, plus Communists who follow the Chinese, Moscow, or Castro lines and fight among themselves.

On the other side, there was a lack of political effectiveness.

Old Trujillistas tried to muscle in, and did gain influence over the junta president, Gen. Antonio Imbert Barreras. Old militarists jealously guarded their power and privilege.

Economically, the country is shot.

Cheating on the Government was a national pastime. Contraband was smuggled in by the military—and merchants. For political reasons, leaders who came after Trujillo inflated wages. At the same time, the props were knocked from under the Dominican export business by the collapse of world market prices for sugar, coffee, and cacao.

To straighten out the mess, it now seems clear, the United States will have to remain deeply involved in Dominican internal affairs for a long time to come.

Economically, the United States is going to have to keep the country afloat.

Politically, the United States already is deeply involved. President García Godoy already is getting political advice from U.S. officials here—although he does not accept it all.

As an example, U.S. officials have objected to several appointments García Godoy has made to his Cabinet, or to other high Government jobs. García Godoy has rejected the U.S. protests, for the most part.

One of his main explanations to American officials who object is this: Non-Communists in the rebel camp must not be isolated, forced to side with the Communists. They must be given another way to go. He wants to offer them that "other way."

Therefore, he says, he is appointing as many moderates and non-Communists, from the rebel camp, as he can.

American officials are not 100 percent satisfied that this tactic will work—but are willing to let García Godoy give it a try. After all, American troops still are in the country, as insurance against a Communist takeover.

The García Godoy tactic is to divide and conquer—which is the U.S. tactic here, too.

THE DOUBLECROSS: A WAY OF LIFE

Involved in this tactic, of course, is the grand old practice of the doublecross. And the doublecross is a grand old Dominican habit, from way back. It is even contagious. Americans have caught the spirit, here, from time to time.

Some examples of the doublecross in this revolution:

Before the revolution, Imbert feared that former President Joaquín Balaguer, his political enemy, planned a coup. Imbert, though an anti-Communist, made a deal with the Castroite 14th of June Movement—even gave it arms.

During the first week in May, the United States decided Imbert was the man to form an anti-Communist junta. Former Ambassador John Bartlow Martin was sent in to persuade Imbert—who really was reluctant, wanted no part of the mess. Mr. Martin denies it now, but some U.S. officials believe that he promised Imbert that the United States would recognize his junta, and help it. United States had no such intention.

Once the junta was formed, Imbert and the military chiefs vowed to stand together to the end. Then, by accident, Imbert learned the chiefs were talking to Mr. Bunker—the OAS negotiator—behind Imbert's back.

The rebels signed two cease-fire agreements—and kept neither.

The rebels signed the compromise peace—then made new demands before they would live up to the agreement.

It's a way of life in Santo Domingo—this doublecross.

The doublecross has to be stressed for one reason. If the tradition of the doublecross is not kept firmly in mind, too much weight might be given to the present promises and agreements.

Ambassador Bunker and his OAS colleagues found this out during the months that they worked to get a compromise political settlement. Promises made one day were broken the next.

For this reason, Americans discussing the chances of getting a settlement in fact, as well as on paper, always preface their discussions with the assurance that the American Army is in the country to protect American interests, if it has to.

U.S. officials make no bones about the fact that they hope the American Army stays in the Dominican Republic for at least 9 months—the full term of the García Godoy government. Some say they hope the troops stay even longer than that.

ANTI-COMMUNISTS, TOO, COULD MAKE TROUBLE

Elements of future trouble are present almost everywhere. Not only are the Communists organizing action groups around the country, and stockpiling weapons, but so are anti-Communist followers of Wessin y Wessin.

In this situation, President García Godoy is moving slowly. He has to, in order to avoid touching off new fighting that will blow up the whole effort to restore law and order and set up a stable Government.

He would like to crack down on the Communist newspaper, *Patria*, for example. But he can't risk it right now. Instead, he hopes the two big papers, *El Caribe* and *Listín Diario*, can resume publishing as soon as possible, so the people have something to read other than Communist propaganda. The two big papers have not published since the start of the revolution. Now the unions, presumably following Communist orders, are keeping them shut down by making exorbitant demands. Unions are demanding full pay for the 4 months that the papers were closed and had no income. Extremists in the unions also talk of handing the papers

over to worker ownership and control—although they call it "people's" ownership.

Other things, too, bother U.S. officials.

Asked whether the Dominicans would be ready for elections in 9 months, one official gave a one-word answer: "No." Juan Bosch bothers the United States, too. To the U.S. Embassy people, Bosch is bad news. They blame him for much of what has gone on this summer. To them, he was a poor administrator, as President in 1962. He did things that helped Communists, like letting some of the most dangerous return from exile. Officials say his constitution of 1963 is a horror, with wording so vague that it gives the President almost any powers he wants to assume. He is anti-Yankee. He pits class against class. The bill of particulars against him goes on and on. Right now, it is thought, Bosch has lost a lot of political popularity. But Bosch is a spell-binder, who, in the opinion of U.S. diplomats, can win back much of his former popularity with a few speeches. Also disturbing to Americans is the return of exiled revolutionaries.

Concern was centered on Máximo López Molina, president of the Chinese-line MPD, or Popular Dominican Movement. López Molina had spent some time in Japan, recently moved to China—and had left China for the Dominican Republic when the provisional Government was formed—or seemed certain to be formed. The Institutional Act of the provisional government, written jointly by the OAS ad hoc committee and Dominicans of both sides, bans deportation or exile. By September 7, López Molina had reached Kingston, Jamaica. A way was found, next day, however, to block him. López Molina was shipped to Paris, where he maintains his permanent home in exile. Other key Communists, however, have returned.

García Godoy is working hand in glove with the Americans, and his goals apparently coincide with the main U.S. goals—unless, of course, there is another doublecross in the works.

U.S. officials here in Santo Domingo still talk about the beating they took from some of the U.S. press at the outset back in April, when Ambassador Bennett issued a call for the marines.

They continue to point out newly revealed evidence of Communist power within the rebel camp, to support their conclusion that U.S. intervention was necessary to save lives and keep the Communists from grabbing power.

U.S. intelligence now can demonstrate that nearly all the Communists who were listed as active when the revolt started still are important in the rebel zone.

AN INTERVIEW WITH WESSIN

Now we come to the case of Gen. Elías Wessin y Wessin. On Tuesday, September 7, the story broke that American officials had offered Wessin a bribe to leave the country.

That morning an anti-Communist Dominican newspaperman got me in to see Wessin—when four carloads of other newsmen were stopped at the outside gates.

The general said that two Americans had offered to buy his \$18,000 home—at any price he named—if he would leave the country and take a tour, as honored guest, of military establishments in Panama and the United States. Wessin said his reply was that he would sell his home for \$50,000, gladly, but that he would use the money to build another and better home, right in front of the old one.

Later that day, another high-ranking Dominican officer told me more about the case. He said that the CIA chief in Santo Domingo and an American military attaché went to Wessin's home at 2:30 a.m. on Sunday, September 5, with the bribe offer.

Next day, high U.S. officials told me a different story. They said no bribe had been

offered, that Wessin initiated the meeting—but it was not at 2:30 in the morning. "It was much earlier than that." There had been other meetings, too. But Wessin asked for each of these, too.

Piecing these two stories together, with some things American officials told later, I think the story is this:

The United States, through García Godoy, put the pressure on Wessin to get out of the country. Wessin dickered, explained he was a poor man, would have to sell his home, liquidate other assets. During the negotiations Wessin initiated individual meetings. Wessin did tell me that he, himself, set the price of \$50,000 on his home.

The story of the physical ouster of Wessin, at 8:05 on the evening of Thursday, September 9, reads like a paperback spy novel. Sometime during the night of September 8-9, Wessin began moving his tanks from the northern part of Santo Domingo back toward his base. He did not inform the Inter-American military headquarters in advance.

There was panic. Ambassador Bunker was pulled out of bed before 4:30 on Thursday morning. He was out of the hotel before 7. He didn't return until 5 in the afternoon.

Wessin's moves were confusing. On Wednesday morning he went before NBC cameras and made his bribe charges openly—the same charges that he had confided secretly to me only 24 hours earlier.

At the same time, Wessin seemed to be yielding to García Godoy's urging that he accept a post abroad for the good of the country. Godoy offered him his choice of several posts. Wessin said, on Wednesday, that he would consider them, and made a date to visit Godoy and give his answer on Thursday morning.

Wessin didn't show up for that date with his commander in chief.

Somebody ordered the Inter-American Peace Force into action—presumably Mr. Bunker. Brig. Gen. John R. Deane, assistant division commander of the 82d Airborne, was sent to Wessin's office. By all accounts, there was a scene. Then, Wessin was escorted to General Deane's headquarters. He was hustled out, an American officer on each arm, and whisked back to his own headquarters, a few miles away.

Later, in the afternoon, an American Air Force C-130 landed at San Isidro. Some baggage was put aboard. U.S. soldiers and plainclothesmen, presumably FBI, guarded the plane. After dark, just before 8 p.m., Wessin arrived by U.S. helicopter, was rushed aboard the airplane, and flown off to Panama. His family was left behind. One of his aids, a major, was the only Dominican to see him off.

The "bum's rush" for Wessin had some bad effects.

American residents, as well as Dominicans, began recalling how Wessin had led the forces against the rebels in the first days. A legend began to grow. Wessin was credited with saving the country from communism in the days before the marines landed. Wessin began to seem 9 feet tall.

American military officers have a more solid, less emotional, objection. Most of them had liked Wessin, and admired him as a military man. Generally, they agree his military did hold off the Communists in April until the marines landed. It is the diplomats who criticize his military actions during the first days.

But the main concern the American military men feel, as expressed by an officer who was brought in for a special high-level job, is this: For years, the United States has been training Latin American officers at Fort Gulick in Panama. These officers are indoctrinated with the idea that the United States depends on them as bulwarks against communism. What, asks the officer, are these Latin American officers going to think about the word of the United States now?

THE REBELS CELEBRATE VICTORY

Meanwhile, as General Wessin was being stripped of his military rank, retired from the Army and forced out of the country by the Americans, the rebels were celebrating their "victory."

At rebel headquarters, in the Copello Building on the main business street, El Conde, I talked with Bill Bailes, an American airplane pilot who has been with the rebels almost from the start.

We commented on how the guns had all but disappeared from the streets of the rebel zone. Mr. Bailes said the guns were still there—that the night before, when rumors spread that Wessin was going to invade, guns sprouted everywhere in the streets.

Mr. Bailes was exuberant with what he believes is a rebel victory. He praised the job that had been done by the "American press."

He said, "You reporters saw through the brainwashing of the American Government," and then added, jokingly, "I am recommending that we strike a medal for the American reporters who covered this story."

One of the sources of strength García Godoy hopes to keep, as a counter to the Communists in the rebel forces, is the military.

As of mid-July, the Dominican armed forces had the following strength figures: 10,000 Army; 3,800 Air Force; 3,600 Navy; more than 10,000 in national police; 1,700 in Wessin's armed forces training center.

I talked with high-ranking military officers, many of whom were gloomy.

One in particular I had seen several times, in May and July, when the purely military situation was much worse than it is now. But never had I seen him so gloomy.

This officer said:

"The situation is worse than anytime since April.

"During April and May, and into June, you at least could have faith in something—the military effort against communism. Now, even that faith has been shattered. The United States seemed to be against Communists then. Now it doesn't seem to be. The United States instead seems to be protecting the Communists.

"Exiled revolutionaries are coming back. Arms are not being collected.

"One provisional government, Imbert's, is out and another one is in—but still the Communists keep their control of downtown Santo Domingo. What did the compromise agreement accomplish?

"The Communists publish their newspapers—but the anti-Communists are ordered off the air, and have no newspapers."

The officer was puzzled by the United States—and said that he felt betrayed, adding:

"We cannot understand your Government. You send thousands to fight communism in Vietnam—but give in to the Communists here."

Neither does this officer think that all the rebel guns will be surrendered or found. He said 2,500 weapons were found in the northern part of the city, after the junta victory in May—but that many others still are there, hidden too well or too deeply to be detected. How many more are being hidden downtown, or in the rest of the country, the officer would not try to guess.

AN ECONOMIC PROBLEM

United States now has not only the political and military problems, but the formidable economic problem as well.

Here are some aspects of the aid problem:

Government budget runs \$15 million a month. Collections fell to \$2 million in May, got up to \$9 million in September, are not expected to reach \$15 million before many months.

Sugar Corporation, Government-owned, loses money and has to borrow \$16 to \$18

million a year to operate. Production costs are higher than the low world prices.

Coffee, a prime export, is in trouble. A few years ago, the Dominican Republic cheated on the World Coffee Agreement, exported more than its quota. Now, it is being penalized. In addition, coffee prices on the world market are very low. Result is that the little coffeegrowers, out in the countryside, aren't able to sell their coffee beans—and don't understand why. That poses a political problem for García Godoy—and the United States.

Cacao prices are down on the world market.

Since Trujillo, the Dominican Republic has been importing more than it can afford. Trujillo was killed in 1961. He had kept a tight rein on imports, showed a yearly favorable balance in current trade accounts. The figures tell the story. Current trade balances, year by year, were: 1960—plus \$42.6 million; 1961—plus \$41.8 million; 1962—minus \$13.5 million; 1963—minus \$22.8 million; 1964—minus \$55.7 million.

All these problems are manageable, however, compared to the really big one:

This has been a country of easy living. People didn't need peso incomes to live. They could pick bananas and get along. But now that's not good enough for them. They want TV sets, and pesos in their pockets. They want schools for their children, and hospitals. Other people have these things, and they want them too. Only problem is that, while they want the benefits that come from a money economy, they don't really understand yet that they have to work for what they get.

Against these problems, and others, the U.S. mission for the Agency for International Development went to work on estimates of what was needed.

The mission came up with an estimate of \$30 million, to start with. It recommended that United States chip in \$20 million, the Dominican Republic the other \$10 million. President Johnson agreed, announced his \$20 million aid program.

Initial planning calls for use of the money in these ways:

Help make up the budget deficits, in monthly operating costs.

Pay half the 1-month salary bonus that all Government employees get in December.

Throw in some money to help rehabilitate manufacturing and business, generally—but not to help commerce.

Finance public works projects. Many already are underway, like the new water system being constructed for Santo Domingo. But in addition, García Godoy is being given a "pot" of \$2 million to throw into public works in areas where it will do the most good politically. Idea is that United States wants García Godoy to succeed, so U. S. money is being given to him to use for semipolitical purposes.

On September 5, 2 days after the García Godoy government took office, the AID people went over the books with the Government. The Dominicans were surprised. They were "wealthier" than they had imagined.

They hadn't heard about President Johnson's promise of \$20 million—because there are no newspapers of general information in the capital.

But, in addition to that, they found that they had:

Thirty-two million dollars in loans negotiated by previous governments, but never drawn.

Twenty to thirty million dollars in new loans that will be available to finance projects the AID mission now is developing.

Six and one-half million dollars in OAS emergency aid that has not been spent yet.

Total aid given since April 24 ran to \$42 million. This was U.S. money, most of which was funneled through OAS.

One reason that \$6.5 million of this aid money has not yet been spent is that United

States now is keeping a closer watch than ever on what is done with aid dollars in the Dominican Republic. In the past, officials say, much of the aid money went down the drain, in stopgap measures.

Now United States intends to be tougher, and make certain that aid extended will help make it possible to end aid later.

MEDICARE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, despite the many words written about it, we continue to receive questions from people who are wondering about the operation of the Medicare Act and how it will affect them and their families. Better Homes & Gardens magazine for October 1965, has done an excellent job in answering these questions with an article entitled "The Simple Facts About Medicare."

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAIN TALK ABOUT FAMILY HEALTH: THE SIMPLE FACTS ABOUT MEDICARE

WHAT MEDICARE WOULD PAY FOR A TYPICAL SERIOUS ILLNESS

Assume that a person 65 or older is covered by medicare's automatic hospital insurance and by the optional medical plan that costs \$3 a month. His doctor orders him into a hospital for an operation followed by 3 weeks of fairly intensive care, a total of 25 days. At \$26 a day for a semiprivate room, his basic bill is \$650. Drugs are an additional \$85. Lab tests and other hospital charges are \$115. His total bill is \$850. He pays \$40 and medicare pays \$810.

The surgeon's and anesthetist's fees, plus visits by the patient's own doctor during the hospitalization, total \$400. If he has already paid \$50 of medical expenses during the year, the patient's 20-percent share of this cost is \$80. Medicare pays \$320.

After leaving the hospital, he enters a nursing home for 30 days of additional recuperation. The cost is \$365, which includes drugs his doctor has prescribed. The first 20 days and the drug costs are paid in full by medicare. For the next 10 days he personally must contribute \$5 a day (\$50 altogether). Medicare pays the other \$315. While in the nursing home he also runs up a \$90 doctor bill. Medicare pays 80 percent of it (\$72). His own cost is thus \$18.

Total costs of the illness are \$1,705. Medicare pays \$1,517. The patient pays \$188.

Despite the millions of words that have been written on medicare, you may still have doubts about how the new law will affect your family. Here are the answers to common, basic questions recently posed by readers:

How much will the law increase your payroll withholdings? How do you qualify for benefits? What is the extent of those benefits? Is your wife's coverage different from yours? How can medicare increase your income tax deductions? Should you cancel your private health insurance policies?

You will help finance the medicare program, plus other expanded benefits, by paying social security tax on the first \$6,600 of your annual earnings after this year, instead of the present \$4,800. Also, the tax rate will go up to 4.2 percent. Thus on \$6,600 or more of earnings, your withholding for social security will be \$277.20, a yearly increase of \$103.20. Of this amount, \$23.10 will be earmarked for your "prepaid" hospital insurance after age 65. Rates will increase again in 1967, to a maximum of \$290.40, with \$33 of that annual tax amount set aside for medicare.

To this extent, your participation in medicare is compulsory. The supplementary insurance program covering doctor bills and certain other expenses is optional. If you sign up for it, the \$3-a-month premiums begin when you reach age 65. They will most likely be deducted from your social security retirement benefits. Voluntary insurance for your wife will cost an additional \$3 a month when she becomes 65.

To qualify for hospital insurance benefits once this part of the program begins on July 1, 1966, the only requirement is that you be 65. It isn't necessary even that you be covered by social security. (After 1967 this rule changes; persons who become 65 after that date will need to have had some work experience under social security.)

There is no "earnings test." You are entitled to full benefits under medicare even though you may have annual earnings over \$1,500 which prevent you from collecting part or all of your social security retirement pension.

For most families (the exceptions being those who otherwise couldn't or wouldn't get proper medical attention) the only change medicare will make in health care is the manner in which it's paid for. Your doctor will be of your own choosing, and he will continue to make all the medical decisions: when and where to hospitalize you, the type of treatment or surgery needed, how long you should remain in the hospital, and what post-hospital care, if any, you need.

When your doctor has admitted you to a hospital, you will simply be asked to show your health insurance card, similar to the Blue Cross card you may now have. Next spring, persons already 65 and receiving social security benefits will receive their cards in the mail. Others will need to apply at their nearest social security office.

Now to the extent of your benefits: Your medicare insurance covers up to 60 days of hospital costs after you pay the first \$40. For up to 30 additional days, you pay \$10 a day and medicare pays the balance. After 90 days in a hospital during a single spell of illness, the hospital benefits stop.

You can thus expect medicare to pick up the bill for the major share of your hospital expenses: room and board, drugs normally furnished by a hospital, operating room charges, care by hospital staff nurses, laboratory fees, and the use of an oxygen tent, wheelchair, or crutches.

Certain "extras," however, must come out of your own pocket: the extra cost of a private room unless your doctor certifies there is a medical need for isolation, the cost of a private duty nurse, and of course such items as TV rental. And unless you are covered by the supplementary insurance program, medicare will not pay doctor bills, in or out of the hospital.

At any time after your third day in the hospital, your doctor may decide you can be cared for just as well and at less expense in a private nursing home that has an arrangement with a hospital. After January 1, 1967, medicare will pay the full cost for up to 20 days of this type of extended care, plus all costs over \$5 a day for an additional 80 days—a total of 100 days. And even after your discharge from a hospital (following at least a 3-day stay) or from an extended care facility, your doctor may prescribe additional medical services while you convalesce at home. If so, and if you are confined to your home, medicare will pay for as many as 100 visits during a 12-month period by a nurse, therapist, or part-time home health aid.

Suppose you suffer a relapse? If it has been less than 60 days since you left the hospital or nursing home, the relapse is considered part of the same "spell of illness" and you are entitled to any unused benefits. For example, assume your initial stay in the hospital was for 40 days and that within the

next 60 days your doctor orders you readmitted. You would still have 20 days during which medicare would pay the full cost, plus 30 more days during which it would pay all costs over \$10 a day. And you'd have 100 days of extended care.

If your relapse were to occur after more than 60 days out of the hospital or nursing home, this would be considered a new spell of illness and you'd be eligible for a whole new round of benefits: hospital, nursing home, and at-home services.

Part of the cost of out-patient diagnostic services you get at a hospital also will be covered by medicare hospital insurance. This can occur even though you are not actually admitted to the hospital.

Examples: X-rays, blood tests, or an electrocardiogram. You pay the first \$20 and 20 percent of the cost over \$20; medicare pays the remaining 80 per cent. If the total cost is, say, \$60, you pay \$20 plus 20 percent of the remaining \$40—that is, \$8. This makes your total cost \$28. Medicare pays the other \$32 toward your bill.

As broad as the new medicare hospital insurance program is, it still falls far short of providing full protection for your after-65 medical needs. But much of what it doesn't cover, the new voluntary medical insurance plan does cover.

Subject to a deductible provision under which you pay the first \$50 of your medical expenses each year, the plan pays 80 percent of the additional costs of:

Physicians' and surgeons' care, without regard to where you receive it—in a hospital, clinic, office, home, or elsewhere. Included are the fees of any radiologists, anesthesiologists, and pathologists who may be required.

Up to 100 home health service visits a year with no requirement of prior hospitalization.

The cost of X-rays, laboratory tests, and special therapy. Some of these expenses may be only partially covered by your hospital insurance, in which case the voluntary plan can be applied to the balance of the cost.

Surgical dressings, splints, casts, ambulance service, rental of equipment such as an iron lung or wheelchair for use in your home, braces, artificial limbs, and eyes.

But remember: insurance under this part of medicare is not automatic. You will need to enroll and agree to pay the \$3-a-month premium at age 65. What's more, there is a deadline. If you will be 65 by the end of this year, the deadline is next March 31. If your 65th birthday is after December 31, 1965, you will have a 7 month sign-up period that begins 3 months before your birthday. After that, the sign-up will be open to you only from October through December during odd-numbered years.

Don't let the deadline slip by. If for no other reason, you'd have to wait two years—without protection—for another opportunity to sign up. And unless you enroll within 3 years from the close of the first sign-up period available to you, you become permanently ineligible. Finally, there's a 10-percent-a-year increase in the premium for each full year you could have been enrolled but weren't.

Your wife's eligibility for medicare is based on her age, not yours. She qualifies for the hospital insurance program simply by becoming 65. If she is receiving social security benefits, either on her own or as your wife, she will get a medicare membership card automatically. Otherwise, she will need to make special application for one.

Suppose that she has never worked under social security. That won't prevent her from obtaining either type of medicare insurance. In the case of the voluntary program, of course, she will still need to enroll (as described above) and pay the \$3-a-month premium.

What if you should die before your wife reaches 65? Assuming you die no sooner than 1968 and are covered by social security at the time of your death, it will not affect

her medicare eligibility. She can still obtain both kinds of coverage once she becomes 65.

Both the benefits and the deductible features of medicare are also determined individually. The fact that you may have used up a part or all of the available benefits for a single illness will have no effect on her benefits, or vice versa.

Similarly, if you enter a hospital and pay the first \$40 of the cost, she must still do likewise if and when she becomes a hospital patient. The same goes for the \$50 deductible payment under the voluntary medical plan: you pay the first \$50 a year of your expense and she pays the first \$50 of hers.

Two new medical tax rules become effective in 1967. One is a tax increase which applies only to persons over 65. The other is a possible tax saving which applies to every family that itemizes its income tax deductions.

If you are over 65, your tax deduction for medical expenses will be limited to the amount that exceeds 3 percent of your income; up to now, after-65 medical expenses have been fully deductible under Federal income tax regulations.

The second change permits you, regardless of age, to deduct one-half the premiums you pay for medical care insurance, up to a minimum deduction of \$150. This is without regard to income and applies to both private medical insurance costs and (in the case of persons over 65) the \$3-a-month cost of the optional medicare plan. And the remaining half of your medical care insurance premiums can be added to other medical expenses to determine whether they exceed 3 percent of your income—and thus indicate what regular medical deduction, if any, you are entitled to.

To see how this works, assume you are not yet 65 and are paying \$220 a year for a private health insurance policy. If you itemize expenses on your 1967 (not your 1965 or 1966) return you can claim a deduction of \$110, regardless of your income or other medical expenses. Then you can add the remaining \$110 to your doctor, hospital, and deductible drug expenses to compute your regular deduction on the amount in excess of 3 percent of your adjusted gross income.

Another way medicare can translate into money and tax savings is if you support an elderly parent. The main advantage, of course, is that it sharply reduces the drain on your own finances if the parent should require expensive medical care. Chances are medicare will pay most of the bill.

If you pay the parent's \$3-a-month premium for the optional medical care plan, this is deductible on your tax return. It also counts toward determining whether you provide more than half of the parent's support costs, as do any medicare "deductible" charges you pay.

On the other hand—and this is important—any benefits the parent receives under medicare will not affect the determination of whether she (or he) is your dependent. For example, suppose your aged mother has a small income of her own, say \$1,500 a year. But counting room, board, and other costs, you've been contributing \$2,000 a year toward her support. Thus, of the \$3,500 total, your share is more than half and you are entitled to claim her as a dependent. Now assume she enters a hospital and later a nursing home, and that her medicare benefits total \$1,800. Can you still claim her as a dependent on the basis of your \$2,000 contribution? Answer: Yes. Medicare benefits do not have to be counted as part of her total support cost.

As for private health insurance, it's still the only protection you have until you reach 65 and until medicare hospital insurance and the optional medical care plan becomes effective on July 1, 1966. Extended care benefits won't be available until 6 months later, on January 1, 1967.

Even then, don't be in a hurry to cancel your private insurance until you've taken a look at what the company has to offer. Obviously, the insurance industry is faced with making major revisions in its coverage for persons over 65. These can be expected to provide protection against expenses not covered by medicare. For example, a catastrophic illness or accident could require more than the 90 days of hospitalization provided by medicare. Or you could require a private duty nurse, another cost not covered by medicare. Nor does medicare cover the cost of drugs except while you are in a hospital or nursing home.

It's also possible your private insurance might cover some of the deductible expenses under medicare, as well as your "co-insurance" cost of \$10 a day after 60 days in a hospital. Or the same policy might provide a weekly income to cover incidental expenses while you are hospitalized.

You'll also want to bear in mind, of course, that once you have dropped your private insurance you may not be able to reinstate it, almost certainly not without a physical exam.

Even if you are not yet 65, it would be a good idea to review your private insurance with your local agent. This is particularly true if you are 60 or older. The reason is that your policy may contain a provision that guarantees it renewable for life, and to the extent that this feature represents one part of the cost of the policy, you may be able to obtain a lower premium or increased health-insurance protection for the same amount of premium.

THE POVERTY PROGRAM IN MINNESOTA

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the poverty program is, above all, the story of people.

It is the story of men and women being helped to find their way to self-support and self-respect after a lifetime on welfare. It is the story of 4-year-old children from low-income families, learning about a new world through the Head Start program. It is teenage boys and girls trying to reverse lifetimes of failure in the Job Corps. It is young men and women now earning enough money to stay in high school, or helping finance their own college education through the work-study program. It is communities mobilizing their resources for an all-out assault on the poverty in their midst. It is community leaders, representatives of the poor, VISTA volunteers, and dedicated professionals—all working together to provide new hope for Americans too long left by the roadside in our national march to prosperity.

Three staff writers of the Minneapolis Tribune—Sam Newlund, Richard P. Kleeman, and Frank Premack—decided to tell this story to the people of Minnesota. They conducted extensive research, and they wrote a series of 10 articles entitled "The War on Poverty," which were published in the Tribune between August 30 and September 10.

These articles tell about low-income Minnesota men and women, boys and girls, who are being helped by the poverty program. They describe many projects in our State, and they discuss, frankly, both the achievements and the problems that have developed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this series of articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Aug. 30, 1965]

THE WAR ON POVERTY: HOW THEY HOPE TO HELP PEOPLE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The "war on poverty" is now a year old. Three Minneapolis Tribune staff writers Sam Newlund, Richard P. Kleeman, and Frank Premack, have pooled their efforts to explain how the major phases of the "war" are being waged in behalf of Minnesota's poor. This is the first of 10 articles.)

(By Sam Newlund)

You couldn't find a more wretched life than John Erickson's. Born to a pair of alcoholics who lived on liquor and welfare, his childhood was smashed by neglect and poverty.

Now 29, he recalled a time when he was 6: The children were living with their mother in northern Minnesota; the father had deserted to St. Paul. Mother got tired of having four kids around the house and "just put us on a Greyhound bus and shipped us to St. Paul."

Erickson (a pseudonym) was recounting the early events of his life that shoved him headlong toward failure and frustration—and made him a human target in the war on poverty.

He is one of several hundred welfare recipients enrolled in a Ramsey County anti-poverty project aimed at getting people off relief and into jobs.

At age 8, Erickson was arrested for stealing \$250 from a car. He was placed in a foster home. Then came the county boys' home, State training school for boys, an escape, a series of other crimes and St. Cloud Reformatory.

From there, a "suicide" attempt while in solitary confinement landed him in the State security hospital at St. Peter as a psychopath. After that * * * parole in 1956, a period of bumming across the country and finally marriage in 1958 to a petite woman of borderline intelligence.

Born of that marriage were two children who died of meningitis, a third who now has a serious kidney defect and a fourth with congenital foot defects. Mrs. Erickson is undergoing tests to determine if she has cancer.

Observed Erickson's caseworker:

"I think he has as many stresses as a man can possibly have."

Because he quit school in the eighth grade, Erickson has little to offer an employer. He has an explosive temper and a record of unreliability on the job.

Virtually all his life, he has been either in institutions or on welfare. His parents were relievers and so are two of his three brothers and sisters.

Says Erickson: "I used to figure to myself * * * well, if I quit my job I'll go back on relief. That's the way we were brought up. When I wasn't on welfare I was in jail—that's all I know."

"Now I'm getting a little tired of having the State and county running our lives."

"I want to get out of this rut."

The Ramsey County Welfare Department has pinned its dubious hopes in Erickson's case on title V of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Title V tries to do what undermanned welfare departments have wanted to do all along—to give relievers something approaching adequate counseling, vocational training, work experience and basic education in an effort to make them self-supporting.

It means catchup classes in English, science and mathematics, like those Erickson attends at Mechanics Arts High School. It means job training, such as the groundskeeper course Erickson hopes to enroll in.

For many relievers, it means more money. Before enrolling in the project, Erickson's family of four lived on \$112 a month in relief money plus rent and utilities. Now the family gets \$231 a month and pays its own rent (\$47) and utilities.

For the Ramsey County Welfare Department the \$4.5 million antipoverty grant—biggest so far in Minnesota—means the hiring of 94 new employees, mostly caseworkers and vocational counselors. A new suite of offices has been set up to handle the load.

The project calls for enrolling 1,000 relief families and 500 families on Aid to Dependent Children (ADC). Only families with minor children and with adults potentially able to land jobs are selected.

The relief families, whose assistance checks ordinarily are lower than ADC families, are moved up to ADC standards. The Federal law thus is a deliberate attempt to encourage States such as Minnesota to expand their ADC programs to include families with a man—an unemployed father—in the house.

Erickson, a brawny man with tattooed forearms, doesn't look poverty-stricken. His family lives in a neat, and adequately furnished three-bedroom apartment in a St. Paul public housing project.

A cool breeze blew from the center courtyard through the Erickson home the other day as he put his feet on a coffee table and talked about his failures and hopes.

"When I was single," he said, "I didn't care whether I worked or not. I always had a roof over my head and something to drink. That was the important thing."

"But I'm getting older now, and I realize that my kids suffer."

Erickson's caseworker, Mrs. Virginia Reher, also believes he has mended his ways because of concern for his children. He was "really shook," Mrs. Reher said, when Erickson's little boy asked him once, "Daddy, why don't you go and work like other daddies do?" "Let's face it," said Erickson, "I've been a bum."

But he saw some hope for a more stable future. Pointing to a television set across the room, he boasted of repairing it the other day and claimed the electronics field as a possible source of income. He also spoke hopefully of landing a good job as a groundskeeper after completing the course offered by the project.

Not all welfare clients have Erickson's problems. Others, like many ADC mothers, may simply be prevented from working by the need to care for small children.

Still others won't become "self-sufficient" because they are not physically or mentally able.

Erickson's prospects of getting off the dole depend on his success in qualifying for a high school diploma, his success in vocational training, the availability of a job and his family's health, among other things. It also will depend on whether his attitude toward work changes for the better.

Mrs. Reher is optimistic, although she conceded that others have considered Erickson a "100 percent loser."

"I think he's going to make it," she said.

WAR ON POVERTY EMPHASIZES LOCAL INITIATIVE, PARTICIPATION BY POOR

The primary vehicle for President Johnson's "war on poverty" is the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, which became law last August 20.

Legislation extending the program for a second year will be signed by the President as soon as a House-Senate conference committee works out final details of the extension approved by both bodies.

Although many Federal agencies are involved, the primary responsibility for coordinating the program and allocating Federal funds rests with the Office of Economic Opportunity, headed by R. Sargent Shriver.

The program emphasizes innovation, local initiative, and participation by the poor. Priority is given to programs coordinated through local antipoverty organizations widely representative of the communities involved.

By mid-June in Minnesota, there were 20 such community action councils either in business or in the final development stage. Thirteen others were being organized.

A State office of economic opportunity acts as an adviser to community action councils and other antipoverty efforts.

In Hennepin County, the action council is the Community Health and Welfare Council.

There has been a notable absence of political controversy over the poverty program in the county—unlike many other parts of the country—because, in the view of many observers, a nonpolitical body is doing the planning.

Here is a capsule summary of the major provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act.

TITLE I

Job Corps: Residential camps where jobless youths learn work habits and job skills.

Neighborhood Youth Corps: Youths work on a variety of jobs in the public interest while living at home, either to help them stay in school or increase their employability.

Work-study: Low-income college students get part-time jobs to help them through school.

TITLE II

Authorizes formation of local councils to devise their own methods of combating poverty.

Project Head Start: Preschool child guidance clinics set up by these councils help poor youngsters catch up to a kindergarten or first grade level.

TITLE III

Low-interest loans to poverty-stricken farm families.

Migrant: Special locally devised programs to aid migrant workers.

TITLE IV

Low-interest small business loans to low-income persons who can't get loans elsewhere, or to firms which will employ the poor.

TITLE V

Work experience: Special efforts to help unemployed heads of households in welfare families to become self-sufficient through vocational or educational training.

TITLE VI

Sets up administration of antipoverty program.

Domestic Peace Corps: Establishes VISTA, corps of volunteers to aid the poor and work in hospitals and various institutions.

THE WAR ON POVERTY: PROJECT HEAD START GIVES YOUNGSTERS EVEN CHANCE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The "war on poverty" is now a year old. Three Minneapolis Tribune staff writers, Sam Newlund, Richard P. Kleeman and Frank Premack, have pooled their efforts to explain how the major phases of the war are being waged in behalf of Minnesota's poor. This is the second of 10 articles.)

(By Sam Newlund)

VINELAND, MINN.—After a week as Project Head Start teacher at Mille Lacs Indian Reservation, Mrs. Dorothy Lemke wrote a report referring to the dozen youngsters who charged into her schoolroom as "little cherubs."

Sarcasm between the lines? Maybe so. But during the project's eighth and final week Mrs. Lemke spoke of incredible changes. If not cherubs, her charges at least were more angelic than before.

Project Head Start is one of the more widely heralded programs in the "war on poverty." A more apt name would be Project Catch Up, since its aim is to help poverty-ridden preschoolers catch up with middle-class youngsters.

It is deemed necessary because even kindergarten and the first grade go on the assumption that education already has begun at home. Most people assume that 5-year-olds know what a circus is, how to handle a knife and fork and a bar of soap, and have at least a corner in their homes where they can sit with crayons and coloring book.

For some children, these things are unknown.

Head Start's thesis is that if such missing bits of civilization can be supplied in a child guidance clinic, then maybe children of the poor can begin school on an equal footing with others.

Most Head Start projects, in Minneapolis and elsewhere, are for children of 4 and 5 who are about to enter kindergarten. Vineland Elementary School, which serves a community of 140 Mille Lacs families, has no kindergarten.

The Mille Lacs project, therefore, is for children of 5, 6 and 7 about to enter first grade. Some already had a taste of first grade, but had dropped out because of illness and family moves.

Who are these children and why do they need Head Start?

There's Henry Sam, Jr., age 6. He's bright-eyed, healthy-looking, and wore a vivid red shirt 1 day during the project's 8th week. He and two sisters live with parents who were high school dropouts.

The Sams live in a one-room frame dwelling measuring about 10 by 12 feet. A rusted chimney droops precariously on the roof. A misshapen screendoor, patched with cardboard, abuts a front stoop of rotting, fallen planks.

The house is atop a weed-infested hill where crickets chatter incessantly. A broken bicycle frame, a mangled baby stroller, an old shoe and a crumpled blanket litter the hard, barren ground in front of the house. A broken oar rests against the house's side.

Inside, Mrs. Sam—a pretty, dark-haired woman of 27—sits stoically making wastepaper baskets from the bark of nearby birch trees.

Mrs. Sam says her husband found work the previous week at a furniture factory. Before that, they lived on unemployment compensation and aid from the Veterans' Administration.

(Head Start records showed the family's annual income was in the \$2,000-\$3,000 bracket.)

Mrs. Sam agrees that Head Start has been good for her son—he now can write his name, she says. But she believes the teacher and volunteer workers tend to "baby him."

Down at the schoolhouse, Mrs. Lemke had rated Henry after the first Head Start week as having limited interest in objects and activities, as needing excessive prompting and constant reassurance to try something new and as being very anxious in new situations.

One of the new activities he and his classmates experienced later in the program was a classroom demonstration of proper tooth-brushing.

Using one of the boys as a "prop," Mrs. Lemke demonstrated the correct technique and showed a filmstrip on the need for good eating habits and regular dental care. With the help of three young volunteer assistants—members of a Catholic Youth Organization group from the Twin Cities—each child was given a brush and marched off to the bathroom to practice.

The program also included medical and dental examinations and care for each child,

psychological evaluations, field trips to a fire station, post office and museum, television viewing and various classroom and playground activities.

On that first day back in June, according to Ross Jorgensen, assistant director of the reservation's community action program, the youngsters stampeded in "like a pack of wild horses."

Reported Mrs. Lemke: By the end of the first week, a marked change was very noticeable. Each child was actually reading pictures, listening for new things, making decisions, speaking up, taking part in each phase, and thinking. (She underlined "thinking.")

Jorgensen singled out Eloise Wind, 6-year-old member of a nine-person household, as an example of startling change. (The family income was listed as under \$1,000 a year; Eloise had been hospitalized at least four times, and she was a victim of skin disease and bronchitis.)

Last fall, the Winds moved from a tiny dilapidated dwelling into 1 of the 28 new reservation homes built by the Government.

In the project's first 2 weeks, Jorgensen wrote in a progress report, Eloise was "silent, distrustful, and withdrawn." During recess she stood fearfully with her back to the schoolhouse wall, "as still and mute as a fawn sensing danger."

The "personalized attention" from one of the volunteer aids, Jorgensen said, wrought a change that "completely reversed" that kind of behavior. After 3 weeks, he said, she was "gregarious and participating in all activities."

One important part of the Mille Lacs program is lunch. Cooked in the school's new kitchen, it is wholesome and plentiful. (All the children reportedly were either anemic or bordering on anemia when the program started.)

Head Start was an undertaking of the Mille Lacs Reservation Business Committee, the governing body of the reservation. There was no problem selecting the children: All those who were to enter first grade this fall were considered in need of the project.

The 15 children who took part were scattered among 142 families, whose income—with only 5 exceptions—fell below the \$3,000 poverty line. More than half the families had incomes of less than \$1,000, according to project records.

Only half the children 14 to 17 were in school, and nearly half the adults over 25 had 7 years of schooling or less.

All but 35 of the 107 housing units were "substandard."

The pothole-studded reservation on the western shore of Lake Mille Lacs is poor farmland, and opportunities for employment are sparse and largely seasonal.

"The pattern of individual family and social disorganization is clearly discernible," according to a summary submitted to Federal officials. "The social contacts of the earlier culture are no longer effective and no other set of standards has been accepted to replace them."

THE WAR ON POVERTY: EDUCATION IS THE STAIRWAY TO CLIMB FROM NEEDINESS

(By Richard P. Kleeman)

(Third of a series)

In one of the University of Minnesota's everlasting "temporary" buildings, an efficient 27-year-old graduate student runs a million-dollar work-study program for needy university students.

Behind a typewriter outside Pierre (Pete) Meyer's office sits Diane Ploske, 17. The top 1965 graduate of Sandstone (Minn.) High School and a new university freshman, Diane is one of hundreds of Minnesota college students whose work-study job earnings make college education possible.

A dozen blocks away at Holmes School, 300 Southeast Fifth Street, a staff is planning the State's first real adult basic education project.

Aiming to provide the 3 R's and a bit more to at least 500 men and women over 18 with less than an eighth grade education, it is expected to start more modestly—for about 50—on September 13.

At first glance there seems little connection between one 90-percent federally financed program, used by at least 25 Minnesota colleges and universities to help low-income students, and another to teach reading, civics, and health to the illiterate, the unemployed, and the school dropout.

But, aside from the fact that adult basic education projects will provide part-time jobs for some college students, the two have a basic, philosophical link: the theory that education—whether at third grade or college graduate level—is a weapon against poverty.

Between "clients" of these antipoverty programs, however, there is a major difference: the young students generally are in college because they are eager to learn.

The adults for whom the basic education program is planned may be reluctant to admit their educational shortcomings: The program will use part-time neighborhood recruiters who may go door-to-door to drum up prospects for the classes, which will be held daytimes or evenings in schools, settlement houses, church basements—anywhere a workable group of 5 to 12 can be gathered regularly.

Diane Ploske, whose ambition is to study law, can expect no financial help from her divorced parents. Her remarried mother has been ill.

With the aid of the \$300 she hopes to save from her \$1.44-an-hour summer typist's job in the university's work-study program office, she'll pay her college room and board. She also will hold down a part-time job and a scholarship.

"I'm very lucky to be able to go on with my education, as one of my two brothers couldn't do," says Diane.

That she heard of the work-study program even before entering the university is a tribute to the intensive efforts of Meyer, her boss, to spread word of it through high school counselors and by speaking to any group that invites him.

That he was quoted in July as still having nearly 900 job openings available is evidence, first, that the word hasn't spread far enough, but also, in his words, that "many students eligible for this program just aren't in college."

Conversely, many college students, needy by almost any standard, still can't meet the Federal program's stiff criterion: family income of \$3,000 or less if there's one child, increased by \$600 for each added dependent. (Meyer's staff also must consider assets—the farmer's tractor, the family home.)

The list of vacant jobs is down to about 450, and Meyer believes he can place any eligible student who applies.

The jobs must be tasks that might have been available before but couldn't be staffed or afforded: reorganizing files, help in long-delayed research, typing that frees a professor for other duties—these are typical.

Most jobs—limited to 15 hours a week during the school term, 40 during vacations—are on campus, but the university also has agreements with eight off-campus nonprofit agencies to take student workers.

Like the university and participating colleges, a contracting agency must expect to put up—in cash—10 percent of the student's pay, to the Federal Government's 90 percent.

The university program is the State's largest: \$1,586,000 in Federal funds have been earmarked (and nearly \$1 million actually paid out) since its inception last January to extend through the 1965-66 school year. Of

this, \$1,032,000 is for students on the Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses.

One of the State's smaller programs is that of the College of St. Benedict, St. Joseph, where \$8,000 in Federal funds (plus the college's 10 percent) has kept eight girls working this summer.

About twice as much will be available for the coming school year to help 25 to 27 girls at the Catholic college.

"As far as we know, every one of these eight girls would not have been able to continue college this fall if she had not been given this opportunity to work," said Sister Mary Cecelia Kapsner, college treasurer. Four girls worked on campus and four in St. Cloud.

All girls on the program have scholarships and college work contracts besides, and still must borrow either under a Federal loan program or through banks, the sister said.

Minneapolis' adult basic education program—first in the State proposed under the Economic Opportunity Act's title II—has two pilot models that preceded it: small programs, each for about three adults.

One was held at Phyllis Wheatley House in north Minneapolis without outside financial support, and one was part of a broader summer war on poverty program to rehabilitate St. Paul relief clients.

Spokesmen for both claimed modest success.

Stanley Baraga, adult education consultant for the Minneapolis public schools, is not discouraged by these tiny pilot programs:

"We know the people are here—statistically," he said, citing the 35,951 Minneapolis residents with 7 or fewer years of schooling, more than 14,000 of whom live in the core city.

The flexible, decentralized program of free classes will be open to any adult needing basic education—with emphasis on the habitually unemployed, relief clients, school dropouts, people rejected for military service for educational shortcomings, migrant workers, foreign language groups, and the culturally deprived—especially racial minorities.

One class for Spanish-speaking people—mostly Mexicans—is planned at Unity House on the North Side under a specially qualified instructor.

A dozen public and private nonprofit agencies have cooperated in planning the program, according to Baraga and Vern F. Wobig, veteran 36-year teacher of industrial arts at Henry High School. Wobig directs the program from the Holmes school office.

Hiring the first of some 20 teachers has begun, even before Federal approval of the \$110,000 asked for the first 4-month program for 500 adults through December 31. Getting the right kind of teacher, Baraga acknowledges, "is one of the biggest problems of this kind of program."

Instructors may be regular teachers in their off-hours, retired educators or those who have left the profession temporarily: A teaching certificate is not necessarily required in adult programs, and all who volunteer will get special training, both before and during the program.

Besides teachers, there will be part-time neighborhood recruiters, a counselor, part-time social worker and curriculum coordinator, and a half-dozen "project newswriters"—who will be residents of the areas served and will publish weekly mimeographed news bulletins to keep up the interest of adults enrolled in the program.

STATE SCHOOLS RECEIVE WORK-STUDY GRANTS

The following work-study grants to 25 Minnesota colleges and universities represent funds actually provided from Washington since the program began last spring and through the fall quarter.

Funds tentatively committed for the rest of the 1965-66 academic year are not included.

	Grants
Augsburg College, Minneapolis	\$3,645
Austin Junior College	4,400
Bemidji State College	63,246
Bethany Lutheran College, Mankato	2,615
Bethel College, St. Paul	26,334
Brainerd Junior College	22,798
College of St. Benedict, St. Joseph	16,661
College of St. Scholastica, Duluth	17,394
College of St. Thomas, St. Paul	21,959
Concordia College, Moorhead	25,904
Concordia College, St. Paul	2,956
Ely Junior College	7,049
Fergus Falls Junior College	2,153
Hamline University, St. Paul	30,629
Hibbing Junior College	65,462
Macalester College, St. Paul	28,551
Mankato State College	83,892
Moorhead State College	88,255
Rochester Junior College	3,779
St. Cloud State College	68,711
St. John's University, Collegeville	58,571
University of Minnesota, Duluth	261,311
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis-St. Paul	599,383
University of Minnesota, Morris	109,452
Winona State College	11,202
Total	1,626,312

THE WAR ON POVERTY: STUDENT EARNING AIDS LEARNING

(By Richard P. Kleeman)
(Fourth of a series)

Dolly Roundtree, 16, a junior at Minneapolis Vocational High School, "needed money to help mother get me through school and buy school clothes."

After 2 months' work on the Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) as a typist at West High Summer School, Dolly, 3413 Third Avenue South, may not have saved much money—but she has her new clothes and "I know what it's like to work in an office with others."

Marie Gleason, 17, 3708 Pillsbury Avenue, never had worked a switchboard before—but after her 2-month role saying "West High—student speaking" she's ready to become a student operator at Central High, where she'll be a senior.

She has banked much of her summer's earnings of around \$180.

These young people—and others like Konstantin Karpovs and Patricia Fox—offer evidence that the NYC, which so far has helped 750 Hennepin County young people with the aid of more than \$250,000 in Federal funds, aims at—and seems to accomplish a triple objective.

It gave youngsters 16 to 21, coming from families of low income and from high schools with high dropout rates—a chance to earn money—perhaps just enough to make the difference between staying in school and having to drop out to take a job.

It exposed them—some for the first time—to the "world of work," and to the need at least for high school training to succeed in it.

And it accomplished a lot of work—work that, at least theoretically, wouldn't otherwise have been done—or done so soon.

Although many of the city's 475 NYC jobholders (and those on the other Hennepin County summer NYC project, which involved 205 youngsters in Mound and Brooklyn Center) worked for public schools, others helped in other public offices or worked for private nonprofit agencies. They earned \$1.25 an hour for up to 15 hours' work a week.

Konstantin Karpovs, 16, whose Latvian-born mother is unemployed, is being helped

through Benilde High School by his family's Latvian Catholic congregation. A senior, he wanted to earn money toward University of Minnesota tuition a year away.

"Konny," 2118 Dupont Avenue South, took a NYC job at the Minnesota Society for Crippled Children and Adults, supposedly to repair wheelchairs (as a youth hosteler, he's had experience with bicycle repairs).

But many other ways to use Konny's "strong back and good mind" were found, according to the society's associate director, James Beaton—including "a fringe benefit for us": the lad's ability as a photographer.

At Hennepin County General Hospital, the day care mental health center had help from four NYC youngsters—three boys and Patricia Fox, 17, 515 Northeast Fourth Street.

Pat, a vocational high senior who wants to be a secretary, "wanted more responsibility to pay my own bills."

After her summer, she has that, plus a new measure of self-confidence gained on a job that ranged from typing and filing to checking the daily free milk supply and exchanging cheery banter with waiting patients.

Or take Sally (not her real name), a good-looking teenager of average intelligence, whose parents are separated, and whose mother is on relief.

Sally was an unmarried mother in junior high school—and ever since she's been shy and withdrawn. She worked in a school office this summer, and after a slow start, gained both office know-how and ease in getting along with people.

Wrote Sally's Neighborhood Youth Corps coordinator (one of six who handled job placement out of North, South, Central and Vocational High Schools, plus referrals from other schools):

"It would appear that Sally's work experience not only served as an opportunity to gain technical skills but, more importantly, has affected her attitudes, personality and self-esteem in a very positive manner."

To qualify them for Neighborhood Youth Corps, youngsters' families had to meet the rigid Federal poverty test: If they came from a family of four (and most, actually, came from families with five or six children), the maximum family income was \$3,400. For each dependent, \$600 was added up to a maximum family income of \$6,000.

Some 1,500 youngsters signed up for the 475 federally financed summer jobs (the local agency puts up 10 percent of a Neighborhood Youth Corps project cost—mainly by providing services and office space rather than cash), according to Paul Boranian, a former North High School coordinator, directs the Minneapolis Neighborhood Youth Corps project.

"Many of these kids might have gone back to school without the program," he concedes. "We have just made it a bit easier for them—and there's no doubt in my mind that we've also saved a full year of learning when they get onto a regular job."

Neighborhood Youth Corps youngsters worked as aids to teachers, librarians, groundskeepers, social workers, playground directors, and other workers.

Because their work was not supposed to replace that of a full-time employee, Neighborhood Youth Corps youngsters performed many a seldom-done job: Schools' fluorescent lighting tubes were washed, athletic fields were weeded, kindergartners' resting mats were cleaned.

Neighborhood Youth Corps, which was started during the closing months of the past school year, seemed to improve school attendance attitudes and habits even of persistent discipline problems, according to a report by the Hennepin County Community Health and Welfare Council, responsible for local antipoverty programs.

Of the 117 who had left the project as of July 15 (about a month before it ended), more than 50 took full-time jobs, 26 failed to report for an assignment and only 2 were dropped for poor work.

Local projects have concentrated on youngsters in school and planning to return there.

In applying for Federal Neighborhood Youth Corps funds for the coming school year and next summer, local officials are encountering a Federal push for emphasis on helping youngsters out of school and out of work—with the aim of encouraging their return to school or at least to job training.

Although this may alter the emphasis in future Neighborhood Youth Corps programs, these are what is now sought for Hennepin County:

A Minneapolis school project placing 700 students on jobs averaging 13 hours a week during the school year and 500 on jobs next summer. Total cost: \$850,250, of which the Federal share will be \$654,082 (nearly 80 percent of which goes in wages to students). Already approved: a school-year program for 625 students with a Federal subsidy of \$390,000.

A Minneapolis park board project, sought since March, to provide part-time park aids' jobs for 389 city youngsters not in school. Sought for this: \$800,000 in Federal funds for a year's operation.

A suburban project, involving all Hennepin County suburban schools except Edina-Morningside, for 293 school youngsters and 38 out of school, costing \$342,000, with \$290,000 from the Federal Government.

THE WAR ON POVERTY: YOUTH CORPS JOBS ARE FOR MONEY, NOT SKILLS

(By Sam Newlund)
(Fifth of a series)

In a press release issued last October, Minnesota Gov. Karl F. Rolvaag said the Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) antipoverty projects to be operated by the State conservation department would "expose these young men to healthful, active outdoor environment and infuse into them a new spirit of self-confidence, citizenship, and purpose."

Last week, Youth Corpsman James Smith, 19, emerged from a tree-cutting excursion into a mosquito-infested marsh on the Carlos Avery State Game Farm in Chisago County with a slightly different view:

"It's just another job," he said. "My little brother can learn how to cut trees down."

This is not to take sides either with the Governor or Smith. Obviously, whatever benefits may flow from such work are not shared equally by all corpsmen.

But it generally is conceded that the conservation department's NYC projects in dozen of parks, forests, and other outdoor places are not going to teach poor youths skills that will help them get jobs. What they can do is put idle youths to work and put money in their pockets.

This is one particular in which the NYC differs with the Job Corps in the "war on poverty." Job corpsmen not only live away from home, they're also supposed to learn a trade.

For better or worse, the trade being taught to youths 16 or 21 at places like Carlos Avery is the skill of getting out of bed in the morning, reporting to work on time, putting in a day's labor, getting along with fellow workers, and taking orders from superiors.

There is no question that many of them need this kind of training. For some, this is their first paying job. Many come from broken homes where they've developed an indifferent attitude toward what social workers call the world of work.

It's safe to say that most of them, at least at the start, are not good job prospects, either because they have little education, no

skills, poor school and work records—or a combination of the above.

For example, Smith, of 1011 Fuller Avenue, St. Paul, quit Central High School at age 16 because he couldn't get along in school too good," and has made abortive attempts at working as an orderly, car washer, and the like. At one point, he said, he suffered a nervous breakdown and spent time at Hastings State Hospital.

He came to the NYC project, he said, after spending 30 days in the workhouse on a trespassing charge.

Smith, like all NYC workers, makes \$1.25 an hour. On the summer project, he works 32 hours a week, Friday being set aside for visits with a counselor at the State employment service.

Smith and his fellow workers—they were clearing and burning brush for a waterfowl habitat—are supervised by a crew leader who is paid \$2.13 an hour.

The St. Paul youth ventured a criticism that paralleled comments made by the game farm director.

Said the youth: "If the NYC had more qualified people to do the supervisory work, it would be better. Maybe college graduates with social work backgrounds."

Since the corpsmen and crew leaders are together for long periods, there would be great potential for influencing the attitudes and behavior of the youths, according to Smith, if the leader were a highly skilled counselor who could gain the confidence of the boys.

Mike Casey, the farm director who is in charge of the Carlos Avery project, felt the same way.

"You don't interest that kind of a fellow at \$2.13 an hour," Casey said. (The job also carries no educational requirement.)

But not all youths on the Conservation Department projects, financed under the Federal Economic Opportunity Act, are high school dropouts.

Among a crew of five working elsewhere at Carlos Avery, one was a college student working for the summer, one was a high school graduate earning money for college, two were still in high school, and the fifth was a high school graduate without college plans.

Planning to go to St. Cloud State College this fall was James Hegler, 17, Forest Lake.

He said he is saving all his money for college but guessed that his parents would have been able to send him whether he worked or not.

Eligibility for NYC projects is being tightened up under new rules laid down by Federal officials. Up to now the Employment Service had no fixed income limits. The determination of what constituted an "impoverished family" was based on a number of factors and left pretty much up to the counselors.

New rules include income limits. For a city family of four, the cutoff would be \$3,130 a year; for a farm family of four, \$2,200.

A Federal NYC brochure published when the poverty war was being launched also promised remedial education to corpsmen who needed it. But this never materialized with the conservation projects, according to an Employment Service spokesman.

A considerable number of conservation corpsmen, many of them school dropouts, have dropped out of the corps.

At Carlos Avery, 2 groups totaling 70 signed up since March. Forty-five have left since, and about 18 of the 45 were fired, according to a project spokesman.

They were fired, Casey said, because they couldn't develop good work habits, couldn't take orders, didn't like the work, or were "troublemakers."

But the State conservation department can cite other projects where all but a handful of boys moved out of the project into

better paying jobs or took on vocational training.

But because methods of recording reasons for leaving have only recently been spelled out, it is difficult to draw conclusions about statewide success.

The department said there was 1 month—July—for which adequate statewide figures are available. For July, a spokesman said, 95 boys quit the various projects. Eighty of them, according to these figures, accepted other jobs, 10 went to "vocational training programs," and 5 were fired.

THE WAR ON POVERTY: WHO SHOULD PLAN PROGRAMS—POOR OR "DOWNTOWN"?

(By Sam Newlund)

(Sixth of a series)

Despite efforts to involve the poor in anti-poverty planning, the war on poverty in Minneapolis is still pretty much a creature of the professionals.

Whether this is good or bad is debatable. And if it is bad, there are circumstances to explain it, at least in part.

But there is discontent among some neighborhood leaders in Minneapolis anti-poverty target areas. They feel that the poor are not adequately represented in the decisionmaking.

The Reverend James Holloway, pastor of Zion Baptist Church in the north target area and a member of the local economic opportunity committee (EOC), was asked about this point.

"I think the program is run by the boys downtown," he said.

The boys downtown are the professional staff members of EOC, which is an arm of the Community Health and Welfare Council of Hennepin County. EOC's job is to plan and screen local anti-poverty schemes, principally under the community action phase of the poverty war.

Joseph Kahle, EOC coordinator, agreed that the statement about "the boys downtown" has been "true up to now."

"We've tried to involve people as much as possible in the neighborhoods," Kahle said. "Until recently there has been little response."

But there is evidence that the neighborhoods now are beginning to sit up and take notice and that the professionals are trying harder to bring the poor more deeply into planning their own salvation.

The issue is pertinent because the Economic Opportunity Act makes a big point of scrapping the paternalism of old social work methods. Whereas downtown used to tell the poor what ailed them and then proceeded to administer the cures (which haven't worked), the new plan is to ask the poor to help mix up their own poverty medicine.

Thus, the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) has decreed that community programs must be "developed, conducted, and administered with the maximum feasible participation of the residents of the areas or neighborhoods in which the programs will be carried out."

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat, of New York, made a fuss about this when his House Education and Labor Committee was considering the bill to extend the poverty war to mid-1967.

POWELL agreed to move the bill out of committee only after R. Sargent Shriver, OEO director, agreed to spell out the participation of the poor.

In St. Paul, a member of the Ramsey County anti-poverty committee, Seth Phillips, resigned in February, claiming that assignment of work to task forces had the effect of excluding representatives of the poor from program planning. (He quickly rejoined the group by request of Mayor Vavoulis.)

In Minneapolis the mandate to involve the neighborhoods has been carried out—at the

top policymaking level—by the appointment of four residents of poverty areas to EOC. Total committee membership is 44.

Kahle listed the four neighborhood representatives—not necessarily poor residents—as Arthur L. Cunningham, chairman of the North Side Community Action Committee; Mr. Holloway; Mrs. Helen M. Starkweather, who has been active in North Side community work, and Mrs. Peter Warhol, a North Side mother active in an Indian anti-poverty group. Cunningham and Mrs. Holloway are Negroes.

In addition, three of EOC's four task forces have neighborhood representatives. They number 3 of 15, 2 of 16, and 3 of 25, respectively.

Besides this, neighborhood residents have been hired to help execute anti-poverty programs. For example, 184 classroom aids were hired in Minneapolis in connection with summer school programs, including Project Head Start. More of the same is planned.

And as various projects began making their way through EOC's planning and screening mill, Kahle and other staff members went to neighborhood groups to ask for suggestions and criticisms.

This is roughly what has happened so far. Now, EOC is asking neighborhood anti-poverty groups in both the north and south target areas to name one more representative each to EOC membership. This would increase membership to 6 on a board of 46 (fewer than 46 if plans materialize to weed out those with poor attendance records).

The idea of just one representative from her group didn't set too well with Mrs. Doris Slaughter, spokesman for the South Side Anti-poverty Lobbying and Screening Committee.

"If we are offered only one representative, we will send no one," Mrs. Slaughter said.

"Put yourself in our place," she said. "If we had 1 down there against 45, we'd just be clobbered. It would be just a token thing." Ten representatives of the poor, instead of six, would be more like it, she said.

Omar Schmidt, welfare council director and topman in the OEO, said he felt that the poor had an adequate voice.

He also said the approach used in Philadelphia, Pa.—a series of poverty area elections to choose members of the anti-poverty council—may have been all right for Philadelphia but was not necessary in Minneapolis because the machinery was already working.

"We've got 45 people on the board," Schmidt said. "We've touched all the bases that Shriver's office said ought to be touched. As far as I'm concerned, we have maximum feasible participation of the poor, not only on the overall committee but on the task forces and in our methods of operation."

But both the downtown social workers and a few leaders of the poor recognize the extreme difficulty in bridging the gap between the planners and the poverty stricken.

By the very nature of their predicament—their lack of education, their preoccupation with grubbing for essentials, their distrust of welfare schemes, and their isolation—the poor are the least able to organize into effective power blocs.

"Who speaks for the poor?" The question is largely unanswered.

The poor complain, too, that social workers—like members of the EOC staff—don't speak their language.

Mrs. Mary Bible, a north side member of an EOC task force, calls it a real language barrier. But the more the professionals came to talk with the neighborhood folks the more this barrier began to break down, Mrs. Bible said.

According to her, members of her neighborhood anti-poverty group are finally beginning to believe that the war on poverty isn't just talk.

Others are yet to be convinced. These include the hard-core victims of poverty, the

semiunderworld types that Mr. Holloway identifies as the pimp, the prostitute, the kid who hangs out in poolrooms, the dope-pusher and the "young hipster who says only fools work."

Kahle and Schmidt are known to differ on how far the committee should go in organizing the poor into power blocs that could lead to such things as a "march on city hall." Schmidt is the more cautious of the two.

But a step in that general direction was taken in June—although the outcome is far from certain. The EOC approved a revised proposal for setting up "neighborhood centers" designed to help solve poverty-related problems. It broadened the plans to include "teams" of poverty area residents to knock on doors and seek out problems.

Kahle said one result could be organizations of poor people who could pressure city officials for improvements in services like garbage disposal, police protection, and relief programs.

But in the poverty program itself, the role of the poverty stricken so far has been largely to make suggestions about programs already being planned.

At the North Side Glenwood Community Center last week, a group of 21 residents met with school principals to discuss a proposal that may be the first exception to the rule. The plan calls for hot lunches in North Side schools, and if it is adopted by the OEO it could be the first Minneapolis plan to originate with poverty-area people themselves.

THE WAR ON POVERTY: JOB CORPS CAMP WAS UNREADY

(By Frank Premack)

(Seventh of a series)

The Job Corps at Camp Atterbury in central Indiana was born prematurely and sickly.

When it opened in haste 4 months ago, it had, in the words of its surviving men and boys, almost nothing going for it—no functioning program, makeshift quarters, little equipment.

Yet, at one time after it opened, nearly 650 youths were sent from their homes to live at the old Army camp, all with little to do. Today, only 375 of these young men, 16 through 21, from all sections of the country, half of them white, half Negro, remain at Atterbury.

The rest have dropped out, have been kicked out or have been transferred to better-run Job Corps camps.

Thirty-five of the youths have come from Minnesota, where the first small Job Corps camps are scheduled to open late this year. More Minnesota youths have been assigned to Atterbury than to any other Job Corps facility in the country.

Ten of the thirty-five from Minnesota have left Atterbury and returned to their homes.

One of them—a youth from a small town in central Minnesota—wrote his mother soon after arriving:

"I guess I made it here alright (sic) but that's all I can say for this place, it sure isn't what I thought it was going to be like. When they said it wasn't like the Army they were right, it's more like a concentration camp. * * * There isn't one, not one good thing I can say about this place."

There are, of course, good things to be said about Atterbury mostly about the young men who have adjusted to life in the camp after 4 difficult months.

They have endured at Atterbury.

They have lived through countless staff shakeups, some linked to an Indiana Democratic factional war between former Gov. Matthew E. Welsh, who was instrumental in getting the program for this State, and Gov. Roger D. Branigin, Welsh's successor, who has washed his hands of the project lest it wash off on him.

They have managed despite hostility from nearby communities, including Indianapolis, 40 miles to the north; despite hostility from Indiana Republicans, who think of the Job Corps as a welfare boondoggle; despite hostility from John Birch Society and Ku Klux Klan quarters, both headquartered in a nearby town and both active in the surrounding counties.

They have survived the taint of numerous incidents, a euphemism used by the camp to describe past disciplinary difficulties that included fist fights with racial overtones, bullying, extortion, widespread thievery and homosexuality.

They have suffered the indignity of having the doors of their barracks' rooms ripped off after seven youths admitted committing sodomy.

In theory, few of these disciplinary problems were anticipated.

The Job Corps, a creature of the Economic Opportunity Act, is designed to take young men and young women who have dropped out of school, who are unemployed, and put them in camps or centers away from home to learn the habits as well as the skills of useful work.

The program is not designed for the hardcore delinquent—"the Job Corps will not be able to enroll youths who show a history of serious and repeated offenses against persons or property," says the 79-page handbook used in selecting trainees. Those youths are written off.

In practice, however, the employment services in the States, which screen applicants for the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), have done a spotty job. Minnesota's State Department of Employment Security has done a topflight job, the OEO says.

But in some other States, the employment services are interested most in the \$30 a head they get for screening.

In some instances, youths have been oversold, told they are a cinch to pick up a skill at the camp and then find employment; in other cases, despite the selection process painstakingly outlined in the screening handbook, boys have been selected who do not fit into the program by any stretch of the imagination.

In addition, the OEO, responsible for administering the war on poverty, has misdirected youths seeking a particular kind of skill to a camp which offers no such vocational training.

Atterbury has suffered from all of these problems.

Its problems have become so acute that the OEO has temporarily stopped sending youths to the camp, which is supposed to grow to 2,600 corpsmen in the next year.

At the end of last month, when the Federal Job Corps Director, Otis Singletary, made a hurried visit to diagnose what had gone wrong, things had settled down at Atterbury.

"The fighting and all that stuff had died down. Most of us are going to class now and that's good. We've got something to do," Eugene Kraus, a youth from New Ulm, Minn., told Singletary, a New Frontiersman who took a leave as chancellor of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro to run the Job Corps.

While disciplinary difficulties appeared to be settled, other problems had not disappeared. Some of the youths, who spend half days in basic education classes picking up reading and mathematics skills, the other half in vocational training, were cutting one or the other to wander aimlessly about the faded and dirty military installation.

The vocational training, supposed to be the heart of the Job Corps program, was still located in temporary quarters, was still lacking some of its classroom equipment and had been in operation less than a month. Boys in food service training, for example, had been doing little else than cutting up and shredding carrots for 3 weeks.

Said Singletary at the end of his tour: "The biggest single thing wrong with Atterbury is the lack of a functioning vocational training program."

When would that be corrected? "As soon as we get all of the shops going," answered the center's third \$20,000-a-year director, James Bryner, 48-year-old educator who has spent his last 11 years as superintendent of schools in a suburb of Cleveland, Ohio. And this, as it turns out, is not likely to occur much before next February 1.

Atterbury offers vocational training in a half-dozen areas: automotive repair, refrigeration and air-conditioning, food handling and preparation, small appliance repair, building maintenance and repair, and heating.

The educational systems division of Litton Systems, Inc., which is bidding for a big Minnesota Job Corps contract, runs the training program, as well as the basic education classes, at Atterbury. This was not always so.

Under the original setup, Midwest Educational Foundation, Inc., a nonprofit corporation formed by then Governor Welsh to get the \$10.8 million Job Corps contract from the OEO, ran everything. Midwest used Litton to design the courses, not to run them or hire the teachers.

In August, when the lack of any vocational training program became overwhelmingly pressing, Midwest and the OEO decided to turn over all educational responsibility to Litton on a \$1.8 million subcontract for the next year.

Litton has had difficulties, too. "Our expectations were given quite a shock," says Harry Stephan, the top Litton man at Atterbury, in talking about the educational levels of the youths assigned to the camp.

We had expected the range of reading abilities to fall generally between the fourth and eighth grades. Instead, reading levels ranged from illiterate to that of a high-school graduate. As a result, course materials had to be rewritten, a process that is still far from being finished.

Stephan insists that the vocational training program will turn out young men who should have no difficulty obtaining employment in the world outside the camp. The youths, themselves, believe this to be true.

But in Minnesota, which is planning for its first big Job Corps facility, there is strong doubt voiced about the ease with which this can be accomplished.

For instance, Robert Brown, Minnesota employment security commissioner and a strong believer in the Job Corps program, thinks the level of training offered at Atterbury and other Job Corps camps is too low for some of the youths and that the range of skills offered is not pegged to tomorrow's labor market.

Brown, one of the small group of planners for Minnesota's big Job Corps, also is critical of the lack of concern in the program about keeping track of its graduates to see that they obtain employment. As things are now set up, the OEO has no plans for notifying a State employment service when a youth either finishes or drops out of the Job Corps.

In Minnesota, the Job Corps planners hope to profit from Atterbury's mistakes. They are seeking something they call an experiment within an experiment, a new kind of Job Corps facility that could serve as a model for the others.

THE WAR ON POVERTY: YOUTH JOB CORPS REVAMPED FOR MINNESOTA

(By Frank Premack)

(Eighth of a series)

The Job Corps, taking its first faltering steps across the Nation, will arrive gingerly in Minnesota this winter.

Four conservation work camps, each designed for 200 youths, are under construction in the north woods.

Two will be operated by the U.S. Forest Service—in the Superior National Forest, 4 miles from Isabella and in the Chippewa National Forest, 10 miles from Cass Lake; one by the Bureau of Indian Affairs—Chippewa Ranch, on Indian lands 12 miles from Mahonmen; one by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife—at Tamarac National Wildlife Refuge, near Rochert.

These small rural camps, reminiscent of the old Civilian Conservation Corps, represent one facet of the two-sided Job Corps. The other kind of Job Corps facility, an urban center capable of handling 1,000 to 3,000 youths, probably will never come to Minnesota.

Instead, this State is likely to get a new kind of Job Corps facility, a combination of the urban and rural aspects of the program.

The planning of this unique Job Corps is a direct result of the Federal Government's experiences, some of them distinctly unpleasant, in contracting with nonprofit corporations and industries for the operation of the dozen big camps across the country.

Its planning, in fact, was requested by the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), and is a tacit admission on the OEO's part that all has not been well with the urban Job Corps.

This has been particularly true of Camp Atterbury in Indiana, which was allowed to open without an operating vocational training program even though the Job Corps concept is committed to teaching unemployed and ill-educated young men and young women the rudimentary skills and habits of useful work.

That is why, at OEO urging, the original plan for a 2,000-youth urban Job Corps center at Grand Rapids, Minn., has been scrapped.

In its place, Youth Training, Inc., a nonprofit group formed at the request of Gov. Karl Rolvaag to get OEO money for an urban center, has submitted a plan calling for a cluster of 200-youth camps around a processing center for 400 youths at Grand Rapids.

The plan utilizes both the conservation work experience of the rural camps and the technical vocational training of the urban centers.

Youth Training, a nine-member board headed by Anoka County Attorney Robert Johnson, has submitted the plan to the OEO, which is expected to act soon.

The new kind of Job Corps, if it gets off the ground as expected, will be run by a private industry, probably the Educational Systems Division of Litton Systems, Inc.

The notion of using an industry—rather than a nonprofit group like Youth Training itself to take over operating responsibility, also derives in part from OEO experience at Atterbury, which floundered for nearly 4 months because of a schizophrenic division of responsibility in the beginning between a private board of community leaders and Litton.

The interest of industry like Litton in the Job Corps is probably twofold: The subcontracts contain profit, and the educational techniques developed at the camps could well be marketed in the future to public school systems from which the youths dropped out in the first place.

The youths who will enter the Job Corps camps in Minnesota this winter will come from all sections of the country, with all manner of backgrounds. Most of them will not come from Minnesota, however.

They will all be assigned by the OEO from young men, 16 through 21, who have volunteered, been screened and recommended by the employment service in their home State.

In Minnesota, this screening is done by the State Department of Employment Security.

It has interviewed approximately 2,000 youths, recommended only 475 of these to the OEO, which, in turn, has assigned but 208 to Job Corps camps.

In its screening, employment security has discovered some unusual cases of educational failure: A rural youth, 19, who has attended school only 2 days in his life, the result of a school system that overlooked the law because it found him to be troublesome; two youths in suburban Hennepin County who were passed through the ninth grade but were functional illiterates.

Statistically, about one-fourth of the 475 youths recommended to the OEO had had a rather serious scrape with the law, and one-half had no police record at all; about one-third had never held any kind of job; 99 percent were school dropouts.

The statistics that have been accumulated do not describe the great individual differences among the corpsmen. At Camp Atterbury, to which more Minnesota youths have been sent than to any other center, a visitor found:

Michael Westlund, 20, 1011 14th Avenue North. He quit North High School in the 10th grade in 1961, worked part time as a dishwasher, then full time as a janitor and a rug cleaner, never made more than \$56 a week.

He is studying the operation, maintenance, and repair of heating equipment at the camp, has put on 20 pounds because of Atterbury's 4,500-calorie diet and is a member of the boxing team, a sport he has learned for the first time.

David Gurno, 17, who came from the Red Lake Indian Reservation, where his widowed mother, three brothers, and one sister still live. He quit school in the 10th grade, was unable to find any kind of job. He has picked auto mechanics as his vocational training choice.

Or the Negro youth who grew up in a ghetto in Detroit, Mich., was orphaned at 9, ran away from a foster home at 10, and has made it, by himself, on the streets and in the gangs ever since.

When he first came to Atterbury, he took out his hostilities by swinging at other corpsmen. He may never pick up a trade at Atterbury but he has learned, in 2 months and with the help of the camp's counseling service, to try to solve problems without the use of his fists.

In many ways, the chief strength of the Job Corps, at Atterbury and elsewhere, can be found in the group living experience rather than simply in the vocational training program.

Ben Robinson, a counselor at Atterbury, puts it this way:

"I find just a fantastic quality in each boy as an individual. These boys are suffering from bad homes, from a lack of basic reading abilities, from you name it. But they are not the 'hard core'; they came here on their own initiative.

"A skill is not what they want at all. They each came here for a different reason, looking for different things—relationships, friends, new interests.

"Look around you," he said, "and you can't possibly say that something mustn't be done for these boys. Now. Not tomorrow."

THE WAR ON POVERTY; SMALL BUSINESS LOANS ARE MADE TO BOOST OPPORTUNITIES

(By Sam Newlund)

(Ninth of a series)

These are some of the Minnesota outposts in the war on poverty:

Waubun, where Mrs. Shirley LaDue will open a beauty salon with a \$7,000 Small Business Administration (SBA) loan.

A farm near Hill City, where the Willard W. Leith family got \$2,300 in Farmers Home Administration (FHA) loans to buy a cow, 26 sheep and certain pieces of farm equipment.

Crookston, where children of migrant workers from Texas attended a school financed with a \$17,000 Federal grant.

Involved here are three of the less publicized assaults on poverty written into the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. As with most, it is too early to say much about their effectiveness.

The SBA poverty loan program, in fact, is barely getting off the ground in Minnesota. According to regional SBA officials, Mrs. LaDue's loan is one of four made so far in the State—all of them through the White Earth Business Development Center.

Total value of these four loans—three at Waubun and one at Ogema, Minn.—is \$47,000.

SBA, a Federal agency, has been making loans for small business ventures for some time. The antipoverty act went a step further, permitting low-interest loans to low-income persons who can't qualify for loans elsewhere—or to persons whose businesses will employ the poor.

No collateral is needed, and the usual requirement of equity in a business is waived. Interest is 5½ percent (4 percent in distressed areas) and the borrower has up to 15 years to repay.

As with many parts of the war on poverty, these small business loans involve setting up additional local committees, although the SBA already is entrenched in the loan business.

These local groups will set up small business development centers and the committees will screen applicants. A proposal for one such professionally staffed center has been drawn for Hennepin County by Omar Schmidt, executive director of the community health and welfare council, the local poverty war agency.

Some questions, however, have been raised about the necessity of setting up separate agencies outside the SBA when the SBA already is geared for the job.

But Harry Sieben, SBA regional director, says local committees are in the best position to screen applications. Without them, SBA's job would be more expensive and time consuming, Sieben said.

In any case, SBA officials see the program as giving persons with business skills but no capital a chance to get on their feet for the first time.

They say Negroes, for example—who may be short of money and the least likely to swing a loan elsewhere—may be able to buy franchises for such businesses as ice cream stores or drycleaning outlets.

Under the program, SBA may require—and pay for—training in good business practice as a condition of the loan.

The farm loans, like the ones that went to the Leiths at Hill City, are similar. But in this case another branch of the Federal Government—the Farmers Home Administration in the Agriculture Department—gets into the act.

Under the antipoverty law's section aimed at "poverty in the rural areas," these loans are an attempt to hunt down the sometimes-hidden pockets of rural poverty and plant seeds of family income.

Ordinary FHA loans can run for 7 years (up to 40 years for real estate) at 5 percent. The poverty loans cost 4½ percent, and can run up to 15 years.

Poverty loan applications are screened by county committees of local residents and processed through the 52 offices of the FHA.

According to Arthur Hansen, State FHA director, 306 poverty loans totaling \$569,730 had been made through his office by Aug. 16. They went for such things as a milkhouse, ponies, minkfarm and tree and brush removal.

The Leiths are using their loans for a tractor, disc, hayrake, mower, stock tank, feed, seed, fertilizer, fencing, and a jet pump in addition to the cow and sheep.

Mr. and Mrs. Leith have nine children and live on a 160-acre farm. But Leith's health has been subpar and the family has done little farming recently. Their income, Mrs. Leith said, came from welfare and veterans' benefits.

With the loan, she said, they hope to raise sheep and perhaps soybeans or other cash crops. "This," she said, "is the opportunity we've been looking for."

Also included in the poverty-in-rural-areas section of the Economic Opportunity Act is a section to aid some of the most poverty stricken of all migrant workers. Declared an announcement put out by the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity:

"Heavy guns of the President's war on poverty have been trained on the misery and squalor in which 2 million migrant farmworkers and their families exist."

So far, it's been more like small arms fire in Minnesota. One project at Crookston in the Red River Valley beef-and-potato area, has been funded so far.

Now completed, the project involved the establishment of an elementary school and day nursery for migrant children. With \$17,258 in Federal funds, it was a consolidation of two similar schools that had been operated separately by the Roman Catholic and Presbyterian Churches.

According to James Turgeon, field representative for the State Office of Economic Opportunity, the nonsectarian nature of the school, staffed by public school teachers, resulted in a heavier turnout of migrant children.

Plans are being made for expanding the program in the Red River Valley, and for antipoverty migrant programs in other parts of the State.

THE WAR ON POVERTY: IN STATE, VISTA PRESSES FORWARD IN SUBTLE WAYS

(By Sam Newlund)

(Last of a series)

CLOQUET, MINN.—A Harvard man with a passion for medieval English literature stretched his long arms and gathered about him a half dozen young, eager listeners.

They watched with great concentration as their mentor spoke with animation, nodding occasionally to one small boy, smiling to another and nudging a third in a gesture of encouragement.

The subject of the conference was how to advance a football beyond an opposing platoon of equally intent youngsters.

Although the Harvard man's academic concerns have little to do with touch football ("I like Chaucer and that sort of thing"), he threw himself into his quarterbacking "with vigor," as another Harvard devotee of touch football might have said.

The Harvard man in Cloquet is 20-year-old Tom Chase, of Hohokus, N.J. He is a Volunteer in Service to America (VISTA), and as such is a member of a citizens militia in the "war on poverty."

His outpost is the Fond du Lac Indian Reservation. He is one of a couple dozen of VISTA's who have served in Minnesota so far (some have since changed assignments).

VISTA is the domestic version of the Peace Corps.

The volunteers spend about 6 weeks in training, then live and work in such places as Indian reservations, urban slum neighborhoods and institutions.

In May, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY spearheaded a VISTA recruitment drive at the University of Minnesota. VISTA officials from Washington, D.C., said at the time that they hoped to sign up 150 to 200 volunteers.

A VISTA spokesman reported Thursday that 27 Minnesotans were on the job as VISTA's in various parts of the country, as of July 31. Fifteen of them were from the university, and all but two were 26 or younger.

All VISTA's dispatched to Minnesota have gone to Indian reservations, with the exception of one group of five originally authorized to work with elderly patients at Oak Terrace State Nursing Home, Glen Lake.

Chase's assignment was not to teach Indian boys the skills of touch football.

But he does spend considerable time in recreation with the youngsters who gather at the Fond du Lac community center. And he doesn't discount the importance of such work, although more obvious antipoverty work is on his agenda.

Besides the benefits of supervised play itself, Chase sees more subtle possibilities.

For example, he said, if only one boy became so interested in football that he stayed in school so he could play the game, then his work would be worthwhile.

In VISTA work the subtleties are probably every bit as important as they are in the overseas Peace Corps. The well-meaning gung-ho volunteers who want to rush out and show the poor how to do things the right way soon realize that they must become inconspicuous, deal with the poor on their own terms, talk their language, and hope that they will do things for themselves.

And as Chase and a fellow VISTA have learned, volunteers must remain strictly neutral when they find that leaders in a poor community do what leaders of any community do. They fight.

Chase, a lanky blond who tends to neglect haircuts, has been at Fond du Lac for 4 months.

He concedes that his work has been rather nebulous so far, although he spoke of positive accomplishments at Mille Lacs, the reservation where he worked previously.

His immediate goal, though, is to survey the reservation and help plan a self-help housing project in which Indian families will do the work. Under this plan, workers will be paid union scale, but the pay will accumulate as equity in their houses.

One of the touchy jobs involved in this project, Chase pointed out, is to find the families most in need of the housing and at the same time likely to be the most dependable workers, capable of assuming a mortgage.

Chase's work is supposed to mesh with projects of the reservation's governing body, the business committee, and with various antipoverty programs of the reservation community action program (CAP). The CAP chieftains are Curtis Lind, director, and Harold LaRose, his assistant.

(Although Lind is a poverty war official, he cautioned against using the word poverty in connection with the reservation. The word has negative connotations, he said, adding that "inopportunities" is the proper term. "Reservation" also is taboo with Lind. "Resident area" is correct, he said.)

The other VISTA at Fond du Lac is Rozanne Glass, 21, Chicago, Ill. (A third volunteer is being transferred out.)

Miss Glass' activities include trying to establish an afterschool place for study and tutoring, and organizing a Brownie troop.

The study hall project also presents delicate dilemmas.

Miss Glass feels that Indian leaders would prefer, out of pride, to keep the study area in the reservation community center. But space there is limited, and children come to the center for recreation, not study.

Downtown, Cloquet school officials have agreed to a school study hall for Indians and whites alike, but they may want it to be staffed by professional teachers. But Fond du Lac children, Miss Glass points out, may avoid a place that looks like just another schoolroom manned by teachers.

Despite such difficulties, both Chase and Miss Glass expect their work to be successful. But their successes may be the kind that can't be measured for several years.

Meantime, they live among the Indian people (Chase has moved into a spare room in a small reservation home) and are paid small living allowances plus \$50 a month payable after completion of their 1-year tours of duty.

Miss Glass, an English major and a graduate of the University of Illinois, said she hopes to become a writer—maybe of textbooks.

Chase, who had dropped out of Harvard before signing up with VISTA, said he plans to go back and continue studying medieval English.

THE PENDING REBEAUTIFICATION OF AMERICA: ANOTHER ADMINISTRATION ACHIEVEMENT

MR. GRUENING. Mr. President, the beautification of our America will be greatly enhanced when S. 2084 is signed into public law. This bill to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems is very important because it brings increased meaning to the phrase "America the beautiful."

Great credit for pointing up the need for this highway beautification act goes to our President and his lovely wife, Lady Bird. It is proper to say that the efforts of our First Lady have made it much easier for the Congress to act on this bill. Mrs. Johnson is an activist. By her action she has this year truly shown how much more beautiful the countryside of America can be when it is given love and care.

By 1968, as millions of visitors come to view the wonders of the Nation's Capital, the highways along which they will travel will be more beautiful thanks to the efforts of millions of Americans. Billboards will have fallen into better perspective, outdoor junkyards will no longer be ugly landscape sores, and, hopefully, landscaping and scenic enhancement will be the objectives of every State in the Union.

The Senate version of S. 2084 was carefully studied before it was reported by the Public Works Committee on which I serve. Great credit can be given to our colleague from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] for his work on this proposed legislation which was reported by the Senate on September 14.

In his excellent message on highway beautification which President Johnson sent to the Congress in May, the President spoke of the need for action to bring beauty to our roads. He said:

By making nature and recreation easily accessible, our highway system can become immensely more valuable in serving the needs of the American people.

So the Congress knows and is acting.

It should be noted that Alaska has no billboard problem. As Governor of the Territory in 1945, I urged adoption of proposed legislation forbidding erection of billboards on the highways. This was done, and later further safeguards were added to the law.

We know that our population increase has made it necessary to change some of America the beautiful. But necessary changes need not be repudiations of America the beautiful. I believe S. 2084 will help us help restore beauty to our land.

We do well to remember and to implement the words of "America the Beautiful" written by Katherine Lee Bates in 1895.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the song be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the song was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL

Oh beautiful for spacious skies, for amber waves of grain;
For purple mountain majesties
Above the fruited plain!
America! America! God shed his grace on thee,
And crown thy good with brotherhood from sea to shining sea.

Oh beautiful for pilgrim feet,
Whose stern, impassioned stress
A thoroughfare for freedom beat
Across the wilderness!
America! America! God mend thine ev'ry flaw,
Confirm thy soul in self-control, thy liberty in law!

Oh beautiful for heroes proved
In liberating strife,
Who more than self their country loved,
And mercy more than life!
America! America! may God thy gold refine
Till all success be nobleness, and ev'ry gain divine!

Oh beautiful for patriot dream
That sees beyond the years
Thine alabaster cities gleam
Undimmed by human tears!
America! America! God shed his grace on thee
And crown thy good with brotherhood from sea to shining sea!

UGANDA CELEBRATES THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I want to extend my compliments and best wishes to the people of Uganda who will be celebrating tomorrow the third anniversary of their national independence. In March of 1962, they received from the British full internal self-government and, on October 9 of the same year, took their place in the international community as a sovereign state.

Facing many challenges, both stimulating and frustrating, Uganda has embarked on a path of national development in hopes of bringing the fruits of modernization to all her citizens. In seeking an effective program for economic advancement, consistent with the nation's values, Uganda has counseled with the World Bank and undertaken a 5-year plan designed to further diversify agriculture, increase production, and expand education facilities.

Concentrating her energies and resources on internal progress, Uganda has adopted in international affairs a policy of nonalignment. She is a member of the United Nations and has participated in various regional activities on the African continent.

Mr. President, the United States enjoys close and friendly relations with Uganda, and it is my sincere hope that our two nations will continue to build such relations based upon mutual respect and understanding.

I join well-wishers throughout the world in congratulating Uganda on the anniversary of her national independence.

FAIR CAMPAIGN PRACTICES COMMITTEE AND ITS NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON BROADCASTING AND ELECTION CAMPAIGNS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, for a number of years I have been aware of the constant efforts of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee to help our political system to function at its best. Therefore, it is with no surprise, but with considerable pleasure, that I learn of yet another substantial effort by that bipartisan body.

I refer, of course, to next week's National Conference on Broadcasting and Election Campaigns, which will convene at the Shoreham Hotel on Wednesday, October 13. Speakers and commentators of prominence and ability have been brought together to discuss ways that broadcasting and politicians can come together and develop the best possible use of the airwaves for political communication.

Luncheon addresses by Howard K. Smith on Wednesday, and Thomas N. Schroth, executive editor of Congressional Quarterly, on Thursday offer one highlight of the 2-day conference.

I take particular interest in the four-panel sessions that will consider the realities, problems and prospects for political broadcasting. The afternoon panel on Wednesday will be addressed by Tom Wicker of the New York Times, the head of opinion research for CBS, former Republican National Committee research director William Prendergast, and Pierre Salinger. These gentlemen will consider where television has brought us and what its demands on politicians mean for our system.

In the Wednesday evening panel, broadcasters, the Federal Communications Commission, a Republican Congressman and an outstanding scholar on campaign costs will look into the difficult question of the FCC's fairness doctrine and the equal opportunity, or equal time, controversy boiling around section 315 of the Communications Act. These speakers are NBC News Vice President Julian Goodman, the FCC's Dr. Hyman Goldin, Representative CHARLES E. GOODELL, of New York, and Dr. Herbert Alexander of the Citizens Research Foundation. Commentators will be FCC General Counsel Geller and CBS General Counsel Leon Brooks, and the panel will be moderated by the president of the Federal Communications Bar Association, Arthur Woleneberg.

The Thursday morning panel is of particular interest to me. It will deal with misuses and abuses of the electronic media. Fair Campaign Committee Executive Director Bruce L. Felknor will probe the recorded telephone message technique, the so-called "dial-a-smear," that has been so abused of late by right extremists. Albert J. Zack of AFL-CIO will discuss irresponsible political broadcasting, looking again at the excesses of the radical right. Congressman WALTER

ROGERS of Texas, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Communications and Power, will discuss legal remedies possible to candidates who are maligned across State lines. John Pemberton of the American Civil Liberties Union will seek to defend freedom of speech from excessive regulatory restrictions, and a conservative writer from New York, Noel Parmentel, will argue that rightwingers have to buy radio programs because of what he sees as a liberal bias in the broadcast media. I suggest that this will be a stimulating session, and it will be moderated by Paul Porter, former chairman of the FCC.

Thursday's afternoon panel will be a conclusion and a look at what we can do better, with still more distinguished participants: Louis G. Cowan, former head of CBS television and now deeply immersed in educational television and communication research; Rowland Evans, the widely read columnist; Stimson Bullitt, a Seattle broadcaster and a sensitive observer of politics and political ethics; and the outstanding student of political broadcasting and the great debates of 1960, Stanley Kelley of Princeton.

Mr. President, I intend to get full reports on this great conference, and to have members of my staff attend and follow it closely. It is a source of deep regret to me that I must be in Wyoming on those dates. But I applaud this conference and am confident that it will start a conversational ball rolling among politicians, broadcasters, and journalists, and scholars, that can only improve the political use of television.

RURAL DELIVERY MAIL SERVICE IS 69 YEARS OLD

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, too often we take for granted the reliable, and often, hazardous service of our country's rural mail carriers.

The rural delivery mail service observed its 69th birthday on October 1, and I wish to offer my congratulations for a job well done.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news story on the rural delivery service as the story appeared in the Fairmont, W. Va., Times on October 4, 1965.

There being no objection, the article was ordered printed as follows:

RURAL DELIVERY MAIL SERVICE 69 YEARS OLD
Rural delivery mail service was 69 years old Friday and as spry as ever.

The Post Office Department reported the service is provided over 1,890,953 miles daily, an increase of more than 50,000 miles during the past 2 years.

In the 1965 fiscal year, 9,823,256 families were served compared with 9,551,915 during the 1963 fiscal year.

Rural delivery was established October 1, 1896 out of three post offices in West Virginia—Charles Town, Hallsboro, and Uvilla—by Postmaster General John Wanamaker.

Although it is taken for granted today, the rural delivery service at first was greeted with ridicule. Critics said the idea of having a mailman trudge all over remote countryside—often through rain and snow, and where there were no roads at all—was ridiculous.

The last surviving carrier from the original group that started on October 1, 1896, Melvin T. Strider, of Charles Town, recalled in an interview before his death several years ago that he didn't trudge a bit.

The bicycle was his original rural carrier vehicle, and the people he served didn't think the service was ridiculous at all. They were delighted to get their mail at home rather than going to the post office some miles away once in a while to see if they had any mail.

Once underway, the service grew rapidly. Five rural routes started on October 1, 1896, including 3 in Charles Town, but there were 82 routes in the first year of operation. At the turn of the century, there were nearly 8,300 routes serving 186,000 miles.

The service reached its peak in number of rural routes in 1925, with 45,189, but only about 1,250,000 miles were served.

Rural carriers today not only serve mail to boxes in front of the homes, but they provide numerous basic postal services. They will accept parcel post, sell money orders, handle registered letters and sell stamps.

In the earliest days, the Department was concerned over a hodgepodge of mail receptacles provided by rural residents, wooden boxes to tomato cans.

Today, through the efforts of postmasters, carriers and other groups, in cooperation with the Department, rural boxes meet uniform standards providing for nice appearance, easy accessibility and protection of the mail.

The growth of rural service has been credited with helping to develop the Nation's highways, the Nation's approximate 31,000 rural carriers and the people they serve has reached near-legend proportions over the years. Dozens of cases are reported each year where the carriers have alerted farm families to a fire or where first aid or other emergency assistance has prevented a farm family tragedy.

WILLIAM MCCOY, SR., DISTINGUISHED WEST VIRGINIA PUBLIC OFFICIAL, DIES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I would like to draw attention to the record of outstanding and distinguished public service which has just drawn to a close for Mr. William McCoy, Sr., of Franklin, W. Va.

Mr. McCoy died on October 5 at the age of 87. During his lifetime, he served as prosecuting attorney for Pendleton County, W. Va., for 30 years—from 1909 to 1939, and he served seven terms in the West Virginia Legislature. I served in the West Virginia House of Delegates with him. In addition to his private law practice and his service to the public, Mr. McCoy also founded Pendleton County's weekly newspaper, the Pendleton Times, which his son, William McCoy, Jr., now edits.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a report of the death of Mr. William McCoy, Sr., as the story appeared in the Pendleton Times on October 7, 1965.

There being no objection, the article was ordered printed as follows:

William McCoy, prominent Pendleton County lawyer and active figure in local and State political and governmental affairs for more than a half-century, died Tuesday afternoon at his home in Franklin. He was 87.

Mr. McCoy had been actively engaged in the practice of law in Franklin since his graduation from law school in 1902 until

about 2 years ago when he retired after suffering a stroke. He served as prosecuting attorney for Pendleton County from 1909 to 1939, and he served seven terms in the West Virginia Legislature. He represented Pendleton County in the house of delegates in 1907-08, and later from 1941 to 1952 and was a member of the powerful rules committee of the house.

He was interested in farming throughout his life, and for many years he operated the Trout Rock farm 3 miles south of Franklin which had been in his family for several generations. In 1913 he founded Pendleton County's weekly newspaper, the Pendleton Times, and retained his interest in it the remainder of his life.

He was a faithful and loyal member of the Franklin Presbyterian Church from childhood and he served for many years as deacon of the church and later as elder.

He received his education in the public schools of Pendleton County and at Hoge Academy, Blackstone, Va., where he won a scholarship to Washington and Lee University for scholastic achievement. He graduated from the Washington and Lee University College of Law in 1902.

Mr. McCoy was born at Franklin June 2, 1878, a son of John and Martha (Price) McCoy. He was married September 18, 1917, to Grace Hedrick who survives.

Surviving in addition to his wife are a daughter, Mrs. Edmund C. (Martha) Burnett of Arlington, Va.; two sons, William McCoy, Jr. of Franklin, and Robert G. McCoy of Springfield, Va.; and six grandchildren.

He was preceded in death by three sisters, Mary and Alice McCoy and Mrs. Byron (Katie) Boggs, and three brothers, Cortlandt, George, and Richard C. McCoy.

Funeral services will be conducted this afternoon at 2 o'clock from the Franklin Presbyterian Church by his pastor, the Reverend J. Wilson Rowe, Jr., and interment will be in Cedar Hill Cemetery.

NEW JERSEY CONFERENCE ON COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS AND THE ELDERLY POOR

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the war on poverty began with an almost total commitment to programs for youth. Obviously, this was a necessary first step. We had to take positive, immediate action to rescue young people from want and waste of talents and energies.

This year, however, Congress has stated in very positive terms that the Office of Economic Opportunity also has a clear commitment to help those older Americans who live in poverty. A provision in the Economic Opportunity Act amendments, sent to President Johnson last month, states:

It is the intention of Congress that whenever feasible the special problems of the elderly shall be considered in the development, conduct, and administration of programs under this act.

Several events preceded this action by Congress. First was the realization within the Office of Economic Opportunity that more had to be done for the elderly. Mr. Sargent Shriver, in fact, had established earlier this year a task force on programs for elderly persons. The National Council on the Aging has made a valuable contribution to this task force by preparing model programs of direct potential assistance to the elderly poor.

Second, the U.S. Senate Committee on Aging, under the leadership of Chair-

man GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida, opened hearings in June on the war on poverty as it affects older Americans. Senator SMATHERS clearly stated the intentions of the committee when he said:

It should be clear * * * that this committee has not decided to declare war on the war on poverty. I personally regard the OEO as the greatest effort ever made by a democratic government to destroy an enemy as old as man. * * * At the moment, however—as these hearings begin—it appears that the OEO has given only minimal attention to our older citizens. The OEO is still young enough to adjust its approach to the elderly; and it is the purpose of this hearing to make certain that it does.

Third, many State and local antipov-erty leaders are planning or implementing imaginative new programs to bring the elderly within community action programs. I am proud to say that New Jersey certainly has done so within the first year of action against poverty.

When the Committee on Aging conducted a hearing in Newark, N.J., on July 10, we heard descriptions of many fine projects which enlist or help the elderly. Now, the New Jersey Office of Economic Development has taken another step. On October 1 in Trenton, Gov. Richard Hughes and the State OEO called an all-day conference on community action programs and the older poor.

The significance of the meeting was described in telegrams by Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY and Mr. Shriver.

The Vice President's message said:

I congratulate you on initiating the Nation's first Conference on Economic Opportunity and the Older Poor. This meeting is further evidence of New Jersey's continued leadership among the States in every aspect of the war against poverty. For it is to the States that we look to perform the vital task of assisting the communities to adapt and utilize the resources developed by the Federal Government. Congress has provided us with several new instruments designed to improve the lives of those of our citizens who are in their late years. The Economic Opportunity Act, along with medicare and the Older Americans Act, is an important means of bringing the Great Society to all of the elderly.

Through the genius of community planning I hope to see the development of new employment opportunities for workers over 45 on the administration of the medicare, community action, and other programs.

I know that your State will attack the problems of poverty in old age with the same vigor that characterized your efforts in the urban and rural areas to provide new opportunities to disadvantaged youth.

Mr. Shriver added these comments:

I was pleased to learn that the New Jersey Office of Economic Opportunity has acted to help us expand the war against poverty to meet the needs of the older poor. Your concern matches the determination of this office to provide expanded resources and opportunities for this group through community action.

We have recently received a series of excellent recommendations from a special task force created to study the problems of the elderly, and we have already allocated \$44 million to fund local action projects, some of which I understand you will be discussing today.

Let me emphasize, however, that the initiative remains with the community action

agencies whose planning and applications throughout the Nation shape our program.

Your intention to review project proposals at this meeting with representatives of the older poor, as well as with public and private agency leaders, and to solicit their suggestions will make an important contribution toward the success of this effort.

Please assure the community action agencies of our active support as they enter this new phase of community action. New Jersey should be proud of its record in developing and operating important antipoverty programs in urban and rural areas, a record which is enhanced by your efforts in behalf of the older poor.

Governor Hughes and New Jersey OEO Director John Bullitt emphatically said in their remarks that New Jersey will do all possible to extend economic opportunities to the older poor.

Dr. Robert K. McCann consultant for older persons for the U.S. OEO assured audience—which included community action planners and representatives of social service and church organizations—said that the nationwide war on poverty would welcome their suggestions for ways to speed practical programs of direct service to older persons living in poverty.

Mr. President, the conference was of direct help to the participants, and its findings will be of great help to others who may contemplate similar action. I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted in the RECORD the remarks of Governor Hughes and Mr. Bullitt.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF GOV. RICHARD J. HUGHES, CONFERENCE ON ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AND THE OLDER POOR, LABOR AND INDUSTRY BUILDING, TRENTON, N.J., OCTOBER 1, 1965

I welcome you to this conference on community action programs and the problems of the older poor.

It is altogether fitting that New Jersey, which has long led the Nation in assisting its older citizens to live lives of greater fulfillment, should also be the first State to launch a substantial community action program in behalf of the impoverished among the elderly.

While much of the war on poverty is, and should be, conducted at the local level, you will forgive me for observing that we have the most active State-level economic opportunity program in America. And our economic opportunity efforts extend throughout our society.

In addition to performing the normal State functions of helping community leaders establish their locally conceived action programs, we have created and are operating a rural youth development program which is serving hundreds of severely disadvantaged school dropouts; we have established an institute to train the personnel who work in antipoverty efforts; we have just completed a unique community organization effort devoted to developing self-help projects in existing pockets of rural poverty in New Jersey; we have created a mechanism which will bring to the indigent a greater measure of justice and protection in the courts; we have mobilized the resources of State government in behalf of the migrant farmworkers, and of course, we participated fully and successfully in the Head Start preschool program which aided more than 11,000 disadvantaged children.

I think that you will agree with me that such a record suggests strongly that we will

also succeed in extending economic opportunities to the older poor.

Let me assure you that this gathering is not the beginning of our concern about poverty among our older citizens. It does, however, signify that our untiring State Office of Economic Opportunity is determined to do more about it. We were honored to have a member of our State office, Mr. Lawrence O. Houstoun, Jr., selected by Director Shriver to serve on a special task force which recently made recommendations to the Federal Government concerning ways in which the older poor might share more equitably in the benefits of antipoverty legislation. You will be discussing the as yet unpublished findings of that task force today, so that in a very real sense this meeting is a testing ground for a new national effort.

Such a venture will, of course, require the concerted effort of all of the new community action programs as well as those public and private agencies which have established themselves already as tested resources in this work. I know that you will be able to count on the support of Director John Bullitt of the Office of Economic Opportunity and of Director Eowe Harger of the State division of aging for help in planning and launching your projects. And I assure you that you can count on me and this administration in your efforts.

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY JOHN C. BULLITT, DIRECTOR, NEW JERSEY OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, AT THE CONFERENCE ON COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS AND THE OLDER POOR, OCTOBER 1, 1965, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRY AUDITORIUM, TRENTON

While it has been said with some truth that the role of State governments in the war on poverty is not paramount, I quarrel with those who consider the States to be an insignificant force in the difficult work of eliminating poverty. Many State agencies (as well as many local and private ones) have been engaged in this kind of work for a long time. One need only consider the major CAP programs emphasized in the act to realize the vital positions of the State capitals. For it is at the State level that most of the critical operating and policy decisions are made in retraining, adult education, public assistance, general education, public health and employment security. While each of these activities has a Federal—and many have local—counterparts, no experienced person would dispute that the authority and resources of the State level agencies is considerable.

On the other hand, those of us who are responsible for mounting new and extensive programs realize all too well that we do not have all the answers here. The war on poverty cries out for innovation—I should say courageous innovation—and in our Nation the ideas that eventually become public programs are frequently conceived, modified, and tested by nongovernmental agencies.

In no aspect of the community action programs is this more true than in its responsibility for the older poor. * * *

It is important to keep in mind when planning new ventures of this sort that great need does not always automatically produce massive response. We know, for instance, that the rapid success of the Head Start program this summer was in considerable part due to the fact that there was an extensively organized constituency immediately available to accept this organizational challenge. No organizational base of remotely comparable magnitude exists which can act as sponsors of projects for the older poor. Those who have been working in this field for many years wearily remind us that this is a youth-oriented culture and that we should not be discouraged when we fail to stir a great popular response. The fact that the economic opportunity program was nearly a year old

before any overt action was taken in behalf of the older poor should serve as sufficient warning to any optimists * * *.

A second purpose of this meeting, therefore, is simply to dramatize the fact that New Jersey's war on poverty has not written off the older poor. I believe that they can bring much to our programs. I believe that our programs can help them in new and important ways * * *.

I ask only that you consider in your community deliberations each prospective project carefully—is this the best first step our community can make? Will it make significant use of local resources beyond the Federal funds? Will it reach the intended target population and make measurable changes in their ability to live outside of poverty? Will it involve the older poor in meaningful ways in its planning and administration? Is it—and only you at the local level can really judge this—is it a sound and prudent investment in economic opportunity for this group * * *.

I want to close by paying particular tribute to Paterson and Newark who have already planned important new programs in this area. Local initiative is the foundation of our work, and as usual New Jersey has no small reservoirs of this vital commodity. I welcome you to this meeting and wish you well in your work with and in behalf of the older poor.

RECESS UNTIL 12:25 P.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 12:25 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 11 o'clock and 34 minutes a.m.) the Senate took a recess until 12:25 p.m.

The Senate reconvened at 12:25 p.m., on the expiration of the recess, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BASS in the chair).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

COURTESY DIPLOMATIC PASSPORTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I believe that the correspondence which I am about to request be printed in the RECORD will be of interest to the Senate. Briefly, this correspondence concerns the practice of the Department of State in recent years of issuing "courtesy" diplomatic passports to retired Foreign Service officers of class I or above who have served as chiefs of mission, and their wives or widows. This practice has been in effect since 1956 except for the years between 1961 and 1963, when it was restricted to former Presidents, Vice Presidents, and Secretaries of State, and their wives or widows. I have no quarrel whatever with extending such courtesy to this latter group, but I continue to doubt the wisdom of including former chiefs of mission of class I and above of the Foreign Service.

It seems to me that there are entirely too many Americans abroad with diplomatic passports or other special privileges, but it is equally clear from the State Department's replies to my letters that the Department does not intend to do anything about this matter.

I do not intend to pursue the subject further at this time, but I hope the Foreign Relations Committee will consider it when the committee takes up the Foreign Service Act amendments next year. If the Department is unwilling to act administratively, perhaps the Congress can devise a legislative remedy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence referred to be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 30, 1965.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of August 2, 1965, concerning the use of courtesy diplomatic passports by individuals engaged in private business and the value of issuing diplomatic passports to Foreign Service staff personnel.

The Department in establishing guidelines for the issuance of courtesy diplomatic passports, as you noted, stated that these passports were not to be used by the bearer while engaged in employment or representation of a private business organization. Both Messrs. Donnelly and Ravndal were issued regular passports on May 25, 1961, and May 9, 1963, respectively. It is presumed that these gentlemen will use these regular passports when traveling in a private business capacity.

The Department of State does not believe that the use of diplomatic passports by certain retired Foreign Service officers is inconsistent with the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. Your letter cites article 40 of that Convention, in particular, as one which would give a third state difficulty is not according special treatment based upon such passports of retired Foreign Service officers. The protection which article 40 of the Vienna Convention provides, including inviolability and such other immunities as may be required to insure the transit and return of the person concerned, is available only to diplomatic agents, members of the administrative and technical or service staffs of the mission, and members of their families. There is no indication in article 1 of the convention, where these categories of personnel are defined, that retired persons could also be included thereunder. It should also be noted the privileges and immunities are only accorded, in the words of the preamble to the Vienna Convention, "to insure the efficient performance of the functions of diplomatic missions," and further that "the purpose of such privileges and immunities is not to benefit individuals." In no case would the United States as a sending state request such privileges and protection for its retired Foreign Service officers, nor would any receiving state, such as Ecuador, be required to give such privileges or protection to a retired Foreign Service officer.

The status of the passports carried by Foreign Service staff officers is also not determinative of the privileges and immunities which are accorded to them either under customary international law, or under the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. Articles 5, 8, 9, and 11 make it clear the appointing of the members of the staff of a diplomatic mission is subject to certain formalities, and it is the completion of these formalities which insure that the privileges and immunities are accorded. A person is categorized under these appointing procedures as a diplomatic agent or as a member of the administrative and technical staff, or as a member of the service staff of the mission, depending upon the functions which he is to perform. Based upon the practice

of most governments a person is considered to be a member of the diplomatic staff of a mission only if he is so recognized and is placed on the "Diplomatic List." Possession of a diplomatic passport alone, without reference to the functions which such a person performs, is therefore not determinative of the extent to which foreign governments are willing either to claim or to grant privileges and immunities under the Vienna Convention.

If I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

H. G. TORBERT, Jr.,
Acting Assistant Secretary
for Congressional Relations.

AUGUST 2, 1965.

Hon. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MACARTHUR: Thank you for your letter of March 30, 1965, in which you enclose a list of those retired Foreign Service officers who possess courtesy diplomatic passports.

The list indicates that several holders of three passports reside abroad. I have also learned that some of these are employed by business firms in the country of their residence.

The status of the Honorable Walter Donnelly, now living in Caracas, Venezuela, and employed by the United States Steel Co., and Christian Ravndal, who is establishing a fish processing plant in Ecuador, seems to be inconsistent with the Department's policy that "the passports are not to be used in conjunction with employment or representation of any private business organization."

The use of these passports might also be inconsistent with certain articles of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations now pending ratification before the U.S. Senate. Article 40 of the convention requires a third state to accord the diplomatic agent immunities required to insure his transit. While the host country may well recognize that they have no obligation to treat this individual as a diplomat, the title on his passport obviously intends to encourage special treatment. While holders of these courtesy passports would be trusted not to abuse their informal privileges, officials of a host country would most assuredly feel quite awkward if faced with the necessity of making certain legal demands upon them.

In addition, I have some doubts about the value of the recent upgrading of certain members of the Foreign Service staff corps. Article I of the Vienna Convention distinguishes the diplomatic staff of a mission from the administrative and technical staff. These categories of embassy employees affect other articles of the convention, for example, article 37, paragraph 2, which limits immunities of civil and administrative employees to acts performed within the course of their duties. The issuing of more diplomatic passports may blur these distinctions, so carefully drafted in the Vienna Convention and endorsed by Secretary Rusk in a letter dated July 9, 1965, to the President of the Senate.

I would greatly appreciate your views on these matters.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 30, 1965.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of March 17, 1965, to the Secretary concerning this Department's issuance of courtesy diplomatic passports.

This Department has issued 129 courtesy diplomatic passports during the past 2 years. I enclose a list showing the persons to whom these passports were issued and, where known, their places of permanent residence. Please let me know if I may be of further assistance in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for
Congressional Relations.

(Enclosure: List.)

LIST OF PASSPORTS ISSUED

Person to whom issued, passport number, and date of application:

Theodore Carter Achilles, Marian Field Achilles, 2855 Woodland Drive NW., Washington, D.C., X016515, X016264, December 9, 1963.

George Venable Allen, 4730 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D.C., X019534, July 20, 1964.

John Moore Allison, Effie Bridewell Allison, 538 Ahakea Street, Honolulu, Hawaii, X016031, X016030, November 5, 1963.

Norman Armour, Myra Armour, 825 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., X015061, X015062, October 28, 1963.

Maude Hunnewell Atherton (widow of Ray Atherton), 3017 O Street NW., Washington, D.C., X016547, December 20, 1963.

Charles Franklin Baldwin, Helen Baldwin, 14 Windsor Road, Farmington, Charlottesville, Va., X020852, X020853, September 30, 1964.

Frederic Pearson Bartlett, Jessie Hendrick Bartlett, 3410 Edmunds Street NW., Washington, D.C., X021086, X021087, October 12, 1964.

Burton Yost Berry, 900 East Sixth Street, Fowler, Ind., X020854, October 1, 1964.

Mildred Barnes Bliss (widow of Robert Woods Bliss), 1537 28th Street NW., Washington, D.C., X018152, May 19, 1964.

Pierre deLagarde Boal, Jeanne deMenthon Boal, Boalsburg, Pa., X015692, September 18, 1963; X016552, December 24, 1963.

Ellis Ormsbee Briggs, Lucy Bernard Briggs, Topsfield, Maine, X015055, August 21, 1963; X015975, October 14, 1963.

Jefferson Caffery, Gertrude McCarthy Caffery (care of Fendrich), 101 Oakley Street, Evansville, Ind., X015279, X015280, August 22, 1963.

Ottile Horsetzky Cannon (widow of Cavenish Welles Cannon), Rua de S. Domingos a Lapa 34-3°, Lisbon, Portugal, X016685, January 16, 1964.

Vinton Chaplin, X020825, September 23, 1964.

Mary Noyes Chapin (widow of Selden Chapin), Running Point, Seal Harbor, Maine, X015973, October 14, 1963.

James Rives Childs, Georgina Childs, 911 Rivermount Avenue, Lynchburg, Va., X015682, September 17, 1963; X016682, January 15, 1964.

Lewis Clark, Anne Covington Clark, 2317 Bancroft Place, Washington, D.C., X016710, X016711, January 30, 1964.

Robert Douglas Coe, Cody, Wyo., X015989, October 18, 1963.

Edward Savage Crocker, Lisenard Seabury Crocker, 580 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., X017359, X017360, March 27, 1964.

Paul Clement Daniels, Main Street, Lakeville, Conn., X018861, June 18, 1964.

William Earl DeCourcy, Lucie D. DeCourcy, 321 Webster Avenue, Winter Park, Fla., X016034, X016035, November 5, 1963.

Walter Joseph Donnelly, Calle Los Jardines No. 4, Country Club, Caracas, Venezuela, X017056, February 26, 1964.

Walter Dowling, Alice Jernigan Dowling, 160 East 84th Street, New York, N.Y., X016016, October 31, 1963; X017027, February 13, 1964.

Gerald A. Drew, Doris Hunter Drew, 70 Henlopen Avenue, Rehoboth Beach, Del., X023125, X023126, March 16, 1965.

Louis Goethe Dreyfus, Jr., Grace Hawes Dreyfus, 370 Hot Springs Road, Santa Barbara, Calif., X017908, X017909, April 29, 1964.

James Clement Dunn, Mary Armour Dunn, Via delle Botteghe Oscure 32, Rome, Italy, X015426, X015427, September 5, 1963.

Cornelius Van H. Engert, Sara Cunningham Engert, 2022 Columbia Road NW., Washington, D.C., X017883, X017884, April 22, 1964.

Eleanor Davis Erhardt (widow of John G. Erhardt), Mount Sinai Road, Coram, N.Y., X016652, January 8, 1964.

Alisia Flack (widow of Joseph Flack), 110 East Ashland Street, Doylestown, Pa., X016028, November 4, 1963.

Alice Vandergrift Gordon (widow of George A. Gordon), 800 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., X016002, October 23, 1963.

Joseph Coy Green (including wife: Gertrude N.), 3610 Raymond Street, Chevy Chase, Md., X022127, January 6, 1965.

Norris Swift Haselton, Elizabeth Garrett Haselton, 4540 Dexter Street NW., Washington, D.C., X019405, July 10, 1964; X019052, June 19, 1964.

Loy Wesley Henderson, 1631 Suters Lane NW., Washington, D.C., X020439, August 31, 1964.

James Hugh Keeley, Mathilde Vossler Keeley Kalaroma Farm, Post Office Box 45, Kintnersville, Bucks County, Pa., X018523, X018524, June 3, 1964.

George Frost Kennan, Annelise E. Kennan, 146 Hodge Road, Princeton, N.J., X017874, X017875, April 16, 1964.

Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, (widow of former President John F. Kennedy), X019515, July 14, 1964.

David McKendree Key, Marjorie Wright Key, Water Island, St. Thomas, V.I., X021068, X021067, October 6, 1964.

Cornelia Baldwin Lane, (widow of Arthur Bliss Lane), 2442 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., X017052, February 25, 1964.

Jeannette Frances L'Heureux, (widow of Herve J. L'Heureux), 5201 38th Street NW., Washington, D.C., X021941, December 16, 1964.

Andrew Green Lynch, 3317 N Street NW., Washington, D.C., X018650, June 12, 1964.

Frederick Bronson Lyon, Elizabeth Sorley Lyon, the Westchester, 3900 Cathedral Avenue, Washington, D.C., X015422, X015423, September 5, 1963.

Lester DeWitt Mallory, Eleanor Mercedes Mallory, 2345 King Place NW., Washington, D.C., X015672, September 16, 1963; X015708, September 19, 1963.

H. Freeman Matthews, Helen Lewis Matthews, 4955 Glenbrook Road NW., Washington, D.C., X015408, August 30, 1963; X015748, October 3, 1963.

Jack Kirkham McFall, Martha Detwiller McFall, 2540 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., X017662, April 10, 1964; X017876, April 17, 1964.

Katherine Typper Marshall (widow of former Secretary of State George C. Marshall), Dodona Manor, Leesburg, Va., X015977, October 15, 1963.

Livingston Tallmadge Merchant, Elizabeth Stiles Merchant, 4853 Loughboro Road NW., Washington, D.C., X017642, March 30, 1964; X017362, March 27, 1964.

Sheldon Tibbetts Mills, Francesca Dekum Mills, 723 Chiquita Road, Santa Barbara, Calif., X021918, X021917, December 7, 1964.

Harold Bronk Minor (including wife, Helen W.), 151 Southwest Sixth Avenue, Boca Raton, Fla., X022442, January 22, 1965.

Frederick Ernest Nolting, Jr., Lindsay Crumpler Nolting, 447 East 52d Street, New York, N.Y., X021143, X021142, October 14, 1964.

R. Henry Norweb, Emery May Holden Norweb, 9511 Lake Shore Boulevard, Cleveland, Ohio, X015968, X015967, October 9, 1963.

Dolores Cabrera Nufer (widow of Albert Frank Nufer), 1775 Southwest 14th Avenue, Miami, Fla., X017358, March 27, 1964.

Edward Page, Jr., Teresita Bartol Page, Kennebunkport, Maine, X015741, X015742, October 1, 1963.

Ely Elliot Palmer, Rancho de la Vista, 4400 Golden Avenue, San Bernardino, Calif., X016208, November 14, 1963.

Jefferson Patterson, Marvin Breckinridge Patterson, 3108 Woodland Drive, Washington, D.C., X017651, X017652, April 3, 1964.

Josephine Roberts Philip (widow of Hoffman Philip), 675 Picacho Lane, Santa Barbara, Calif., X017062, February 28, 1964.

Edwin August Plitt, Jeanne Riboulet Plitt, 3205 Cleveland Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., X016050, X016049, November 8, 1963.

Leon Baquero Poullada, Lella Dean Jackson Poullada, 501 Grand Avenue, St. Paul, Minn., X017327, March 17, 1964; X017911, April 29, 1964.

Karl Lott Rankin, Pauline Rankin, Post Office Box 10, Bridgton, Maine, X015739, October 1, 1963; X015723, September 25, 1963.

Christian Magelssen Ravndal, Alberta Mor Ravndal, 700 Manor Road, Maitland, Fla., X015728, X015720, September 26, 1963.

Roy Richard Rubottom, Jr., 3720 Wentwood Drive, Dallas, Tex., X022354, January 21, 1965.

Rudolf E. Schoenfeld, 2121 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., X018158, May 19, 1964.

Robert McGregor Scotten, Ann Scotten, Nelson Gay, St. Peter, Barbados, West Indies, X018606, X018605, June 8, 1964.

Harold Shantz, care of Metropolitan Club, Washington, D.C., X016520, December 12, 1963.

George Price Shaw, Ann Hunter Shaw, 4518 Plitt Street, New Orleans, La., X021930, X021929, December 11, 1964.

John Farr Simmons, Caroline Thompson Simmons, 2915 44th Street, Washington, D.C., X017300, X017301, March 11, 1964.

Edward J. Sparks, Andree V. Sparks, La Rabida 5219, Santiago, Chile, X018159, X018301, May 19, 1964.

Philip Dodson Sprouse, c/o Marjorie S. Rappaport (sister), 1079 Creston Road, Berkeley, Calif., X020847, September 30, 1964.

Edwin F. Stanton, Josephine K. Stanton, 85 Housatonic Drive, Devon, Conn., X017278, X017279, March 5, 1964.

Howard Hobson Tewksbury, Barbara Swain Tewksbury, New Ipswich, N.H., X021948, X021947, December 21, 1964.

Harold Hilgard Tittmann, Eleanor Barclay Tittmann, 3328 Reservoir Road NW., Washington, D.C., X015424, X015425, September 5, 1963.

Somerville Pinkney Tuck, Katherine Tuck, 180 Country Club Drive, Grosse Pointe, Mich., X016026, X016027, November 4, 1963.

Henry Serrano Villard, Tamara Villard, 3312 R Street NW., Washington, D.C., X020545, September 2, 1964; X021359, October 30, 1964.

Edward Thompson Walles, Cornelia Lyon Walles, 2804 34th Place NW., Washington, D.C., X016211, X016212, November 18, 1963.

Walter Newbold Walmsley, Maria-Teresa Walmsley, 308 Waddington Road, Birmingham, Mich., X016044, X016045, November 8, 1963.

Clifton R. Wharton, Leonie Wharton, permanent address undetermined. Mailing address at time of application: Park Crescent Hotel, 150 Riverside Drive, New York, N.Y., X020820, X020821, September 27, 1964.

John Campbell White, Elizabeth Moffat White, Barnstable Hill, Chester, Md., X017878, X017879, April 20, 1964.

Frances Elizabeth Willis, 503 West Highland Avenue, Redlands, Calif., X021340, October 22, 1964.

Orme Wilson, Alice Borland Wilson, 2406 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D.C., X017661, April 10, 1964; X017873, April 16, 1964.

Stanley Woodward, Sarah Rutherford Woodward, 3009 N Street NW., Washington, D.C., X018308, X018309, May 25, 1964.

MARCH 17, 1965.

HON. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I return to the matter of the Department of State's issuance of courtesy diplomatic passports, which was the subject of some correspondence between us in 1963.

In connection with the current balance-of-payments discussions and the proposal of the administration to discourage tourist travel abroad, I would appreciate having a list of the number of courtesy diplomatic passports issued during the last 2 years (calendar or fiscal), to whom they were issued, and the place of permanent residence of the person to whom they were issued.

Thank you for your attention to this request.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., December 6, 1963,

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am responding to your October 28 letter to the Secretary of State inquiring further concerning the issuance of diplomatic passports to retired career ambassadors, career ministers, FSO-1's who have served as chiefs of mission, and to their wives and widows.

Your letter cited a passage from Hackworth, "Digest of International Law," which could be interpreted to mean that a diplomatic passport will assure diplomatic privileges and immunities to the bearer. Actually, however, the granting of diplomatic privileges and immunities by a foreign country is completely separate from the issuance of diplomatic passports by the United States. The fact that an individual has a diplomatic passport does not entitle him to diplomatic privileges and immunities in a foreign country.

Those persons in the classes referred to above who have been issued courtesy diplomatic passports have been notified that they may not use them in connection with any business trips abroad. After receiving your letter, the Department reviewed its procedures, to insure that this limitation is properly policed. To this end we will require that all requests for revalidation of such courtesy diplomatic passports be accompanied by a statement of the purpose of the proposed trip.

I am enclosing a copy of the Department's press release announcing the new policy.

If I may be of any further assistance in this matter, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

OCTOBER 25, 1963.

HON. FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I refer to your letter of September 11 concerning the issuance of courtesy diplomatic passports to retired career ambassadors, career ministers, Foreign Service officers, class 1, who have served as chief of missions, and to their wives and widows. I am not satisfied with the response to the questions raised in my letter of August 15 to Secretary of State Rusk.

The Department justifies its new policy governing the issuance of courtesy diplomatic passports to select categories of persons on

the ground that it "felt that this was a small but meaningful tribute to their many years of faithful service to their country." If, indeed, the basis for the policy is "many years of faithful service," why not make any retired high-ranking Government official—executive, legislative, or judicial—eligible for such a passport? Assuredly, I am not arguing for such an extension, although it would seem logical in view of the yardstick the Department applies.

On the other hand, it is difficult to see much, if any, relationship between the Department's standard and the case of a "wife" or "widow," especially one, let us say, whose marriage to a career ambassador, career minister or class I Foreign Service officer may not even have taken place until after the official's retirement from Government.

In your letter you note that from 1956 to 1961 retired career ambassadors were accorded "courtesy fee diplomatic passports." What led the Department of State to decide in 1961 not to continue this practice, and why did the Department decide this year not only to make career ambassadors eligible again, but to broaden the register of eligibles? Has a request for a courtesy diplomatic passport ever been turned down by the Department?

The eminent international lawyer, Green Hackworth describes the nature of a diplomatic passport in the following terms ("Digest of International Law," vol. III (1942), p. 452):

"A diplomatic passport serves both as a travel document and as a certification of the official identity of the bearer. It is designed to assure to the bearer the enjoyment of special privileges and immunities accruing to him on account of his official position. The transaction of business of a diplomatic character is therefore expedited, and the officials of the country in which the bearer of the passport is traveling are put on notice concerning his diplomatic status and his right to the enjoyment of the privileges and immunities flowing therefrom."

I realize a small handful of persons have been eligible for courtesy diplomatic passports in the past. Yet, in view of Hackworth's description quoted above, I wonder why the Department feels it desirable to make eligible for diplomatic passports several hundred more persons who would not be traveling abroad in any official capacity whatsoever; and yet would be entitled to enjoy special privileges and immunities.

Please send me a copy of the memorandum, order, or whatever paper put the new policy into effect. I find unclear just what restrictions will be placed on the issuance of these passports, and the policy involved seems to me very questionable.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., September 11, 1963.
Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: This is in response to your letter of August 19 addressed to the Secretary of State concerning the Department's recent decision to issue courtesy passports to career ambassadors and certain other retired Foreign Service officers.

Retired career ambassadors were first accorded courtesy fee diplomatic passports in 1956, as a result of a memorandum issued by Under Secretary of State Loy W. Henderson. However, in 1961 issuance of such passports was restricted to: (1) former Presidents of the United States, their wives or their widows; (2) former Vice Presidents of the United States, their wives or widows; and (3) former Secretaries of State of the United States, their wives or widows. It was stipulated that courtesy fee diplomatic passports were not to be used by any person in these

categories during any period while he or she was employed by or representing any non-Federal organization. This stipulation is still in effect.

On August 9 the Department of State, by direction of the Acting Secretary, renewed issuance of courtesy fee diplomatic passports to retired career ambassadors, career ministers, and to class I Foreign Service officers who served as chiefs of mission during their careers. The Department felt that this was a small but meaningful tribute to their many years of faithful service to their country. There was no intention to discriminate against class I officers who did not serve as chief of mission; we considered it necessary to limit those eligible for this courtesy in order to make the honor a truly distinctive one.

With respect to your concern of possible abuses of the privilege of customs clearance, we are confident that any officer who has achieved the rank of career ambassador, career minister, or Foreign Service officer, class I, and has been appointed ambassador would not cause embarrassment to our Government and would not abuse his courtesy passport.

The Department estimates that less than 200 such individuals, including widows, are eligible for courtesy fee diplomatic passports; moreover, it is likely that less than half would apply. Further, the Department does not anticipate that this courtesy will be extended to persons other than those specified above.

If there is any further information you would like, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

AUGUST 19, 1963.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I noted a press release of August 9, 1963, announcing that the "Department will issue courtesy passports to retired Foreign Service officers who achieved the rank of career ambassador, career minister, or class I, and who served as chiefs of mission during their careers."

It seems to me that this decision creates an undesirable precedent and raises a number of questions. Why, for example, should there be discrimination against class I officers who did not serve as chiefs of mission, or against class II officers who may have served as long as beneficiaries of the ruling?

Furthermore, I should think that the privilege of customs clearance, for example, might easily be abused by retired officers, or their wives, residing abroad for protracted periods and that such abuses might be most difficult to detect.

I would be interested in knowing the reasons why this decision was made and in having an estimate of the number of individuals who, if they applied, might be entitled at this time to receive diplomatic passports.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE RELEASE NO. 412,
AUGUST 9, 1963

By direction of Acting Secretary George W. Ball, the Department will issue courtesy diplomatic passports to retired Foreign Service officers who achieved the rank of career ambassador, career minister, or class I, and who served as chiefs of mission during their careers. Wives and widows of Foreign Service officers in these three categories will also be eligible for such courtesy passports.

The passports are not to be used in conjunction with employment or representation of any private business organization. They

will be issued upon application and payment of the regular passport fees.

Mr. Ball said the Department was pleased to extend this small but meaningful courtesy to this distinguished group of retired Foreign Service officers in recognition of their many years of outstanding service.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the right to work is a fundamental American right. Every American citizen has a right to seek a job and perform that job undisturbed by physical interference or by any legal barrier. To in any way deny this right, under any pretense or plan, violates the liberty guaranteed by our Constitution and prized by all Americans.

Nebraska has a right-to-work law. This is not only a statute but it is a part of the constitution of the sovereign State of Nebraska. This section of our constitution provides in substance that an individual cannot be compelled to join or remain in a labor organization in order to keep or hold a job, and it prohibits entering into a contract which would impose such a requirement. That provision was put into our constitution by a vote of the people. Many other States have similar laws. I believe that most of the right-to-work laws were enacted by vote of the people themselves.

It is my personal belief that a true interpretation of the Constitution of the United States would permit a State to have a right-to-work law if that State would so choose, without the direct permission of a Federal statute. Nevertheless, the doctrines of the courts are to the effect that the Federal Government has preempted the field of labor-management legislation and, therefore, the consent of the Federal Government must be maintained if a State is to have a right-to-work law. When the Taft-Hartley law was written, section 14(b) was inserted, which reserved to the States this right.

Now the forces of monopoly and the enemies of individual liberty seek to repeal section 14(b). This issue is now before the Senate. The effort to repeal this section is the very antithesis of true liberalism. This effort is reactionary to the "nth" degree. To repeal section 14(b) would be a step backward in the struggle for the rights of man.

There are those who do not favor a right-to-work law. I respect their opinion, although I disagree with them. The

issue before the Senate, however, is whether or not a sovereign State shall have the right to enact a right-to-work law if the people of that State so choose.

I am for labor unions, but I believe they should be voluntary and not compulsory. It is argued that repeal of section 14(b) merely would give labor and management a right to agree to have compulsory unionism. Mr. President, constitutional rights should never be destroyed for any individual by any agreement of this nature. Such a procedure would still override the rights of individuals and the rights of minorities.

It is well established that management, when faced with a demand for a contract providing for compulsory unionism, can give in on that point without any monetary loss to the company. The argument that it must be agreed to is without substance so far as protecting the rights of individuals is concerned.

It is also argued that unions raise the wages for all and that they improve working conditions and increase fringe benefits. With this I agree. It is further contended, however, that because all workers benefit they all should be forced to join the union and pay dues or else they are free riders. I am not impressed by the free rider argument. A similar situation exists in many other areas of our national life. I know of few people, if any, who would live in a community that had no churches. Everyone benefits from churches, yet we would not think of abolishing religious liberty and requiring compulsory church membership in order to prevent having a few free riders.

Mr. President, this reactionary effort to repeal section 14(b) involves a very fundamental principle. The country is on our side. I believe that even a greater majority of the people of the United States will be opposed to repeal as the facts are unfolded in this debate. There is so much involved here that if it takes all the rest of the calendar year of 1965, and all of the calendar year of 1966, to turn back the forces of reaction and prevent the repeal of section 14(b), it is a price that can and will be paid. We will win.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum on the time of the minority leader and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Who yields time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, since Monday of this week we have been considering the motion to take up 14(b). It is the pending business before the Senate. There have been some interruptions, such as calendar bills, nominations, conference reports, the morning hour,

and a few speeches on extraneous matters.

The Parliamentarian's record indicates that we have spent only 18 hours on the business in hand. Compare this with the reapportionment amendment which covered 44 days, or the Civil Rights Act of 1960, which covered 37 days, or the Telstar proposal which consumed 18 days. The time, devoted, therefore, to 14(b) is miniscule by comparison.

I fully appreciate the majority leader's problem. No kindlier, no more forbearing, and no more tolerant person ever set foot in shoe leather, or graced this great body. His hope is to finish Senate business and adjourn. I believe every Member shares that hope.

But the issue before us is of transcendent importance. Unlike Telstar, it involves human beings. Unlike civil rights, it involves all human beings regardless of race, sex, or national origin.

Since principle and deep conviction are involved the issue is not lightly disposed. People are awakening to the issue but it takes time to alert a country of 190 million.

When we began this discussion we made it abundantly clear that the Nation must be informed. This is not the work of a day or a week. I am sensible of the fact that we have been here 9 months. I know Members are battle weary.

But so are those who slog through the monsoon mud of Vietnam. So are they who man the bunkers in Korea. So are all those who have gone before who gave us a country undominated by economic groups, free from abuses of labor barons and untainted by wildcat strikes.

Shall we who are dedicated to our cause relent now in a well moving effort to advise the Nation that the very Federal-State system is at stake? Shall we now forfeit the momentum which is gaining in speed and volume in every section of the country?

The majority leader proposes to table his own motion to consider and stated on Tuesday, when he addressed the Senate, that he would vote against his own motion. He was kind enough, as he always is, to furnish me with an advance copy of his remarks. I have calmly considered the proposal. I believe he is right. The effort to educate and inform has only begun. It must continue.

To the majority, I suggest that you support your own noble leader. To the minority, I suggest that you support your humble leader. To table resolves no issue. It but sweeps it under the legislative rug. Let the debate continue in orderly fashion. Let us demonstrate to the world that this is still a deliberative body. Let us uphold the Senate tradition of free and untrammelled discussion. Let us not publicly confess that the pressures of any economic group have caused the Senate to make a mockery of the deliberative process. I therefore urge all Senators to vote with the majority leader when he votes against his own motion to table, as he will shortly do. Let the vote, in fact, be a unanimous vote of this great body.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am overwhelmed by the cooperation of the distinguished minority leader. He has gone far beyond the call of duty in urging Members on his side of the aisle to support the motion which the Senator from Montana will shortly make.

Mr. President, the Senate was advised last Tuesday that a vote would be had today. Since last Wednesday, the Senate has been on notice that the vote would occur, by unanimous consent, at 1 p.m. In a few moments, the Senate will vote on a tabling motion.

Each Senator should be clear as to the significance of the impending vote. It will not be, in any sense, a cure-all for the present predicament. It will be, at best, indicative of the Senate's will on this single procedural question: "Does the Senate with the leadership, at this time, to pursue the effort to bring the question of repeal of section 14(b) before the Senate?"

The vote cannot be expected to express the sentiment of the Senate, one way or the other, on the merits of the repeal of section 14(b). Certainly, I would anticipate that Senators who desire the repeal of section 14(b) in this session will vote against the motion to table. It is also possible that those who are against the repeal of section 14(b) but who desire the issue to be disposed of one way or the other in this session will also vote against the motion to table. There may be other reasons for so voting but, in all frankness, I can conceive of no other which would be of any great relevance to the resolution of this matter.

So, I repeat, the leadership will interpret the vote as indicative only of the Senate's will on this single procedural question: "Does the Senate wish the leadership, at this time, to pursue the effort to bring the question of repeal of section 14(b) before the Senate?"

To underscore the interpretation, I serve notice now that if the outcome of the vote on tabling warrants it, I shall offer for signature, at once, a motion for cloture on the single question of proceeding to consider H.R. 77. I would urge Senators, therefore, who vote against the tabling motion to bear in mind this subsequent intention of the leadership. It is the judgment of the leadership that these two interrelated votes provide about the only practicable and orderly way out of the predicament in which the Senate finds itself.

Make no mistake, the leadership appreciates fully that each Senator decides for himself for what reasons he casts his vote, and obviously one vote does not bind for a second. But if the leadership has a responsibility for recommending a course to the Senate in a predicament of this kind, the leadership also has a

responsibility to make clear the direction in which it hopes the course will lead.

If the leadership seeks a test of the sentiment of the Senate, the leadership must also form a judgment of the results of the test. So the Senate is on notice: if the vote on the tabling motion warrants it, I shall ask the Senate, promptly, to join the leadership in a vote for cloture on the single question of the motion to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 77. I stress that the cloture motion which may be filed will not apply on the issue of H.R. 77 itself. It will apply only to the single procedural question of whether or not H.R. 77 should be taken up by the Senate at that time.

For those who would protest that we have not had enough time to consider this question, I can only reply that the Senate has already been a week in trying to make up its mind on a simple procedural question which is normally disposed of in a matter of seconds. In fact, while, strictly speaking, the Senate has not been out of order under the rules, it has been out of logic. It has spent virtually no time at all in discussing the pending question which is to proceed to consideration. Rather, in discussion, it has jumped over that question and is, in fact, almost wholly engaged in a debate on H.R. 77 even though the matter is not even pending. That is a "hugger-mugger," designed only to delay.

To save the Senate and the press the trouble of going to the dictionary, the definition of "hugger-mugger" is "a disorderly jumble; a confusion; a mumbo-jumbo—"

As an example of its usage, Webster's International gives the following:

Apart from the effect of all this unwholesome hugger-mugger on their minds, there was the greater tragedy that they were being short-changed educationally.

The delay, indeed, has been such that this is the first time that this leadership has been confronted with the necessity of contemplating cloture in an effort to assist the Senate over a simple procedural question. If I may be forgiven a colloquialism, I think that the Senate has reached the point of put up or shut up.

Speaking as a Senator from Montana, I should like, once again, to state my individual position. I shall vote to reject the motion to table. If the vote on that motion warrants it, I shall sponsor a cloture motion, which will bring a vote on the sole question of taking up H.R. 77. If the Senate decides to invoke cloture and H.R. 77 becomes the pending business and can then be brought to the point of final resolution, I shall vote for repeal of 14(b).

Speaking as the majority leader, however, I am constrained to point out that the impending vote is but the first limited step in the course which the Senator from Montana would like to see pursued to the end. But I am under no illusions, and the Senate ought not to be under any illusions, as to the significance of this vote. A rejection of the motion to table, even by a substantial majority, will not insure that the Senate will proceed forthwith to the consideration of 14(b), much less will it insure that the issue of 14(b) will be resolved. Insofar as the leader-

ship is concerned, a vote against tabling will be taken to mean, and I would hope that it means, that the Senate desires the leadership to try to bring the question before the Senate at this time. Furthermore, in the context of the many currents which are running in the Senate, and, as the leadership sees the problem, this indicated desire must be confirmed promptly by cloture on the question of taking up H.R. 77. Only in that fashion, in my judgment, is there any prospect at all of a resolution of this issue during the current session.

I want to say in closing that the majority leader alone is responsible for the motion which is to be offered and the effort to invoke cloture which may follow it. I have consulted no other Member; there are no understandings, agreements, or "deals" with anyone involved. The responsibility for the procedure which is being recommended attaches to the majority leader, and the majority leader alone. All that the majority leader asks at this point is the Senate's help and best guidance in the vote which is about to be taken.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in conformity with my previous promise to the Senate, despite the fact that I intend to vote against it, I move that the pending motion to be tabled, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] to lay on the table his motion to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 77.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent on official business and, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 0, nays 94, as follows:

[No. 284 Leg.]

YEAS—0

NAYS—94

Aiken
Allott

Bartlett
Bass

Bayh
Bennett

Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill

Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalfe
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt

Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—6

Anderson
Brewster
Cannon
Scott
Smathers
Young, Ohio

So Mr. MANSFIELD's motion to lay on the table his motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 77 was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am almost moved to make a motion to reconsider and table once more. No leader has ever received such support on such an important question, and no leader is more undeserving.

Mr. President—

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that Senators are apparently determined by their unanimous vote to press this issue to a conclusion at this time.

CLOTURE MOTION

I now send to the desk a motion for cloture on the proposition that debate on the motion to proceed to consider H.R. 77 shall be brought to a close. It is properly signed by the requisite number of Senators.

Thanks to rule XXII, Senators will have a prompt opportunity to give procedural flesh to the skeleton of senatorial intent which this vote, in my judgment, has just established.

If there are no objections, it would be my intention, but not until after I have consulted with the distinguished minority leader, to ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in recess until 9 o'clock a.m. tomorrow, with the understanding that the Senate will come in at that time for a pro forma session only and recess immediately until 12 o'clock noon Monday.

In this fashion, the requirements of rule XXII will have been met and Senators will have the weekend to ponder their positions, and vote on cloture can be had on Monday.

Let me say to the Senate that there is—as Senators well know—a much simpler and less time-consuming way to resolve this procedural problem. If the Senate is prepared at this time to vote on the pending motion to proceed to consider H.R. 77, it can of course give immediate substance to the test vote.

If the "hugger-mugger" is now over, the vote indeed can be taken right now.

Mr. President, I ask that the cloture motion be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the cloture motion.

The legislative clerk read the motion, as follows:

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate upon the motion to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 77, an act to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

MIKE MANSFIELD.

LEE METCALF.

PAT McNAMARA.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON.

JOHN O. PASTORE.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

VANCE HARTKE.

DANIEL K. INOUE.

FRED R. HARRIS.

ERNEST GRUENING.

PHILIP A. HART.

MAURINE NEUBERGER.

CLAIBORNE PELL.

ROSS BASS.

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

JOSEPH S. CLARK.

FRANK CHURCH.

ABRAHAM RIBICOFF.

WALTER F. MONDALE.

CLIFFORD P. CASE.

BIRCH BAYH.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President—

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me proceed first, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it stand in recess until 9 o'clock a.m. tomorrow for the purpose of holding a pro forma session only.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish the distinguished Senator from Montana to know that I admire his forthright stand both as leader and as a Senator from Montana.

I hope the Senator realizes that there are Senators who have a distinctly different viewpoint from his own.

The Senator from Florida has had no opportunity to be heard on this matter. He has been tied up on a conference on the farm bill for 9 successive days with distinguished colleagues on that task of public service. He has also been tied up on other Senate matters. He has to go to a full meeting of the Senate Committee on Appropriations for a markup in a few minutes' time, and he will have to have at least Monday to have time enough to express himself.

This is his situation. The State which he represents in part, was the first State to become a right-to-work State. It did it by a vote of the people of Florida, who put the provision into their State constitution. We have had an opportunity

to see how it works. Our State has virtually trebled its population since that time, although this is not the only reason for that. It has also greatly increased in prosperity, in per capita income, and in the average payment of wages to its workers, and in every other kind of progress that can be enumerated.

Therefore, I do not believe that the distinguished Senator from Montana wishes to cut off other Senators who have a distinct interest in this issue, though different from his, and wish an opportunity to be heard in such detail as to express what they believe to be the opinion of their States.

I hope that the Senator from Montana will not insist upon this request. If he does so, I shall be forced to object—

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I do insist.

Mr. HOLLAND. I object, Mr. President.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

RECESS UNTIL 9 O'CLOCK A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana moves that the Senate stand in—

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 9 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I know that the motion—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair informs the Senator from Illinois that the question is not debatable.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I know that it is not debatable, but I ask—

The VICE PRESIDENT. With that understanding, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in my judgment, the cloture motion is absolutely valid. It qualifies with respect to the number of signatures. If the Senate comes in for a pro forma session tomorrow morning, it will qualify under the requirement that there must be 1 intervening day, and that on the next legislative day the Senate must proceed to dispose of the matter.

I make this inquiry only because my understanding of the rule is that when the Senate convenes on Monday, the majority leader must first ask for a call of the quorum and the Chair must be satisfied that a quorum is present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is 1 hour after the Senate convenes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct. Thereafter, it is mandatory to proceed to a vote on the cloture motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has properly stated the rule.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me say that—

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. I do not wish to have any Senator violating the rule. The motion is not debatable. A Senator

must ask unanimous consent to speak on this question.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to ask a question of the majority leader.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Rhode Island may proceed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I should like to address myself to the majority leader. If the Senate does not meet tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock for a pro forma session, is there anything to preclude the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] from speaking as long as he wishes tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Nothing at all.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President—

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida will have to ask unanimous consent to do so.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address a question to the majority leader.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Florida may proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Perhaps I do not understand the meaning of a pro forma session. I am asking the distinguished majority leader if his understanding is the same as mine that a pro forma meeting is to meet and then adjourn as quickly as the Presiding Officer can put down the gavel, without any speeches and without any opportunity to be heard?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator's analysis is correct; but that is not the motion now before the Senate, as I understand, because, on the basis of his objection, that motion was washed out and now it calls for a regular session tomorrow morning, though I would still prefer to have a pro forma session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana is correct. The motion of the Senator from Montana does not relate to a pro forma session but to a regular session of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Unfortunately.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Regrettably.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted "yea" when his name was called.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There will be order in the galleries.

The question is on the motion to recess until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is it too late to make a parliamentary inquiry?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will indulge the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; I would like a strict interpretation of the rules.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not in order.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader may be permitted to address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, in an effort to preserve the rules of the Senate, which he knows Senators would like to have him do, informs Senators that the Senator whose name was first called on the rollo call has responded.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator did not hear it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Therefore, the Chair believes that the Senate should proceed in order.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I am not sure that a unanimous consent is out of order.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader may be permitted to propound a parliamentary inquiry of the Chair.

Mr. MORSE. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will resume the call of the roll.

The call of the roll was resumed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There will be order.

The clerk will proceed.

The call of the roll was resumed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk cannot hear the responses of Senators. The Chair asks that Senators cease their conversations.

The clerk will proceed.

The rollo call was resumed and concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 285 Leg.]

YEAS—94

Aiken	Bible	Case
Allott	Boggs	Church
Bartlett	Burdick	Clark
Bass	Byrd, Va.	Cooper
Bayh	Byrd, W. Va.	Cotton
Bennett	Carlson	Curtis

Dirksen	Kennedy, N.Y.	Pastore
Dodd	Kuchel	Pearson
Dominick	Lausche	Pell
Douglas	Long, Mo.	Prouty
Eastland	Long, La.	Proxmire
Ellender	Magnuson	Randolph
Ervin	Mansfield	Ribicoff
Fannin	McCarthy	Robertson
Fong	McClellan	Russell, S.C.
Fulbright	McGee	Russell, Ga.
Gore	McGovern	Saltonstall
Gruening	McIntyre	Simpson
Harris	McNamara	Smith
Hart	Metcalf	Sparkman
Hartke	Miller	Stennis
Hayden	Mondale	Symington
Hickenlooper	Monroney	Talmadge
Hill	Montoya	Thurmond
Holland	Morse	Tower
Hruska	Morton	Tydings
Inouye	Moss	Williams, N.J.
Jackson	Mundt	Williams, Del.
Javits	Murphy	Yarborough
Jordan, N.C.	Muskie	Young, N. Dak.
Jordan, Idaho	Nelson	
Kennedy, Mass.	Neuberger	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—6

Anderson	Cannon	Smathers
Brewster	Scott	Young, Ohio

The VICE PRESIDENT. The vote on the motion to recess until 9 a.m. tomorrow is—94 "yeas," no "nays." The Senate is in recess.

RECESS TO 9 A.M. TOMORROW

So (at 1 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, October 9, 1965, at 9 o'clock a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Field Tradition Continues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT MCCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 8, 1965

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, since September 18, 1965, much has been said and written about Marshall Field, Jr., whose untimely death saddened the Nation. I join with the other Members of this body who have already paid tribute to this distinguished editor, publisher, educator, philanthropist, patriot, World War II veteran, husband, and father.

Marshall Field, Jr., was a part-time resident of the 12th Illinois Congressional District, maintaining a home at Lake Forest. His passing represents a loss of a personal friend in addition to the loss of a great citizen which the Nation and the free world has sustained.

I am reminded today of the excellence of the lifetime pursuits of Marshall Field, Jr., as I note that two highly respected newspapermen have been promoted to carry on his plans and policies. Emmet Dedmon was named editor of the Chicago Sun-Times and Larry Fanning was named editor of the Chicago Daily News. During Mr. Field's administration of these two great metropolitan dailies, they worked closely with him and contributed significantly to the growth of their respective journals. The shadow of Mar-

shall Field, Jr., lengthens as the institutions into which he breathed his integrity continue to develop under the able guidance of those whom he chose. That they will carry on his dedicated program, keeping these newspapers in the best traditions of the free press, is not only predictable but assured.

U.S. Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 8, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the Honorable TOM CURTIS of Missouri, discusses in a recent report to his constituents the basic concepts which he believes must underlie U.S. foreign policy. I believe this penetrating analysis of the subject should be called to the attention of the Members. The full text of the report follows:

A REPORT FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN, TOM CURTIS, REPRESENTING ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MO.

(Member of the Ways and Means Committee, Joint Economic Committee)

OCTOBER 1965.

DEAR CONSTITUENTS: I have seldom discussed substantive aspects of our foreign policy in my newsletter. However, with con-

stant breakdowns in our foreign policy occurring—I regard war as a breakdown, a failure, in our foreign policy—I think nothing at the present time is more important to all of us. The Korean war was a breakdown, Cuba was a breakdown, Santo Domingo and Vietnam are other breakdowns.

As most of you know my comments have been primarily directed to the economic aspects of our foreign policy, to a large degree, because my committee assignments require me to dig deeply into these areas, hopefully to inform the House on these matters. The Foreign Affairs Committee has the assignment of keeping the House informed on overall political foreign policy.

My first comment is a regrettable one. The House Foreign Affairs Committee has not done its homework and at present is not doing its homework. I think the primary difficulty arises from the little effort made by the executive department to assist in or encourage the Foreign Affairs Committee to do its homework. President Johnson thinks calling the Congressmen down to the White House to lecture to them behind closed doors or sending a State Department official to Capitol Hill for similar lecturing is an adequate substitute for knowledgeable executive officials appearing before the appropriate congressional committees to testify in public hearings under cross examination and to reply to rebuttal witnesses on the issues. Of course, it is no substitute at all. The result is that our foreign policy has been made behind closed doors at the White House with no one in the Congress or the public knowing really who participates in the decisions or what assumptions of fact and logic have been made as a base for them.

Now that the decisions have resulted in failure—to the extent that they have resulted in war, not caused war, but certainly not prevented war—certainly it is time to review